

THE
PROTESTANT'S
TRYAL

(In Controverted Points of Faith)

BY THE
WRITTEN WORD.

Return back to Judgment, Dan. c. xiii. v. 49.

To the Law and to the Testimony. Isa. c. viii. v. 20.



B R U S S E L S :

Printed in the Year M D C C X L V.



ERRATA.

PAGE 5. Line 23. *dele* if not Millions. p. 15.
l. 12. *read* refer. p. 26. l. 21. *r.* uphold. p.
37. l. 10. *r.* pretend. p. 57. l. 23. *Samaria*,
r. *Dothan*. p. 78. l. 5. *r.* elementary. p. 93. l.
11. *r.* Transubstantiation. p. 108. l. 2. *dele* a'e,
after is. p. 110. l. 18. by, *r.* of. p. 116. l. 30.
dele Semicolon, *after* all. p. 132. l. 7. *r.* Apostle.
p. 160. l. 27. *put a Comma after is, and dele the*
Comma after Law, ibid. p. 171. l. 7. *r.* Fasts.
p. 173. l. 3. *r.* Fasts. p. 198. l. 16. *dele* with
the Plague.



P R E F A C E.



T was a Maxim taught by all the Ring-leaders of the Reformation, and is current among their Followers to this very Day, *That the Written Word of God, as it is understood by every Person of sound Judgment, is the whole Rule of Faith*: That all Things necessary to Salvation are therein clearly contained: And that nothing is to be believed with divine Faith, but what may be from thence clearly proved: That every one has a Right, which no Authority on Earth can deprive him of, to read and interpret Scripture for himself; that so every Protestant having thus learnt his Religion from the Bible, his Faith may not be built on the Authority of Men but upon *the pure Word of God.*

When Catholicks objected against these Maxims, that there can be no Security for

private Persons, that their Interpretation of Scripture will be always true, and yet unless the Scriptures are taken in their true meaning, they can neither be *the whole Rule of Faith*, or indeed, *any Rule at all*: That nothing is more apt to lead People into the strongest Delusions than inspired Writings, when the Sense of them is misunderstood, and they are read and expounded without *the Key of Science*; consequently, that the foregoing Maxims of the Reform, were much more likely to open a door to all Kinds of Errours and Heresies, than to lead any one to the Discovery of the true Religion. The Ring-leaders of the Reform replied.

That if their People would but apply themselves to the reading and study of Scripture, with a sincere Love of Truth; if they would divest themselves of Prejudice and Partiality, and at the same time beg of God the Gift of interpreting Scripture; they need not fear that God would leave them destitute of Means sufficient, for understanding at least all Points necessary to Salvation, or suffer them to fall into any fundamental Errours, and finally to miscarry.

These Maxims altho' they served the turn of the first Reformers, so far at least as to tempt great Numbers to forsake the Catho-
lick

P R E F A C E.

lick Church, who went over to the Protestant Party, for the sake of this Privilege of reading and interpreting Scripture for themselves, which makes every Partizan of Error a sovereign independent Judge in all Matters of Controversy, Judge even of his Judges, and Judge in his own Cause too; yet within a short time, these Principles had a very bad Consequence among Protestants themselves, and occasioned vast Numbers to turn Enthusiasts and Dissenters, which indeed was but the natural Consequence of the Maxims which themselves had taught. For all Protestant People who betook themselves to the reading and study of Scripture, easily persuaded themselves that they were Persons of *sound Judgment*; that they had a great share of *Sincerity* and *Impartiality*, *Love of Truth*, and *no Prejudice*; they flattered themselves too, that they had not been backward in praying for the Light of Heaven, to guide their Understanding; and being at the same time assured by the Apostles of the Reformation, that whosoever shall read the Scriptures with these good Intentions, and pious Dispositions, cannot fail of discovering the true Religion; the Consequence was, that whatever Errours each one imbibed by mistaken Interpretations of Scripture,

whatever Scheme of Religion each one fixed upon, that, they concluded, was *the true Religion*; acted in that Supposition to the End of their Lives, and their Followers continue in the same Supposition to this Day. Thus the Protestant Rule of Faith. *The Written Word as understood by every Man of sound Judgment*, (no one allowing his own Judgment to be unsound) created a numerous Swarm of Sects, which have most horribly plagued one another ever since; Lutherans, Sacramentarians, Prelatick-Protestants, Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Quakers, and a hundred more, among whom was a Sect of Protestants in Silesia called *Swenkfeldians*, who canvassed the Text of Scripture, till at length they pretended to prove from Scripture, *that the Scriptures are needless to Salvation*.

*Refs View
of Religi-
ons Sec.
viii.*

Quest. 12.

But what is yet more remarkable, Protestants who so hotly contend that the *Written Word is the whole Rule of Faith*, by which Rule all their Sects at their first beginning pretended to form themselves, do not follow this their own Rule at present, in the choice of the several Religions they now profess. For which of them can say they took up the Profession of their Religion from reading the Bible, since it is undeniable Fact, that they

P R E F A C E.

vii

they are all pre-engaged to some Party or Sect, before they have ever read the Bible, or are in any Capacity to understand it? And altho' they pretend to derive their Religion from *the pure Word of God alone*, most evident it is, that in their Child-hood they follow the natural way of Tradition, which is that of Children believing their Parents and other Teachers; (which Tradition of theirs is however infinitely Defective, since it cannot possibly ascend higher than *Luther*, who was the first of all Protestants.) Nor can they with any appearance of Truth affirm, that after they came to Years of Discretion, they then laid aside all the Prejudices they had imbibed in their Minority, studied the Scriptures attentively, and so made choice of their Religion anew *by the pure Word of God*.

Others may be observed among them, who follow their Religion, because it suits best with their present Interest or present Humour; and with many it is a Maxim, to adhere to that Religion, which they find established in the Country where Providence hath cast their Lot, without endeavouring to give themselves any farther Satisfaction about the Truth of it: Nay, having from their Child-hood acted in a supposition that it is true, they ever after studiously decline

P R E F A C E.

all serious Examination, for fear it should prove false, and then their Conscience should force them to undergo the inconveniency of a Change. So that if Truth may be spoke, there is scarce a Protestant in Christendom that owes his Religion to his Rule of Faith, *the Written Word of God as understood by every Man of sound Judgment*, but either to Interest, or Inclination, or to the Place of his Birth, or to the Custom of the Country where he lives. Now if these are good Reasons to justify any Sect of Protestants in the Choice they have made, the same will equally justify every Sect of them, even those which are contrary to one another, and therefore can justify none of them at all. This therefore being undeniable, that Protestants have not followed their own Rule of Faith, *the Written Word* in the Choice of the several Religions they now Profess, and they all pre-engage themselves to their Sect before they have ever read the Scriptures, it is not without good Reason, we summon them back to the Tryal: *Return back to Judgment: To the Law and to the Testimony.*

That the holy Scripture is of great weight, in deciding Controversy, and ought strenuously to be insisted upon in Dispute, nay, that

P R E F A C E.

that it is even an infallible Rule in what it Teaches, *when we are fully assured of the true Sense of it*, is what no Roman Catholic denies; and every Protestant must confess, that when this sacred Book is interpreted in a wrong Sense, it is then no Rule at all. Whosoever then has built his Belief upon the Words of Scripture, misunderstood, has not in fact built his Religion upon *the Word of God*, as he vainly imagines, but upon the Conceptions of his own Mind, which indeed may be called *the Word of Man*, and may very possibly be fraught with Errours contrary to the Word of God, but can never be set in equal Authority with it.

Yet Protestants are the People who abhor the Thought of a Religion which is built upon the Authority of Men, and for this Reason they appeal from Fathers, from Tradition, from general Councils, thro' preference, that the Pastors and Doctors of the Church, which compose these most august Assemblies *are but Men*. *The Word of God*, say Protestants, is above them all, and our Faith shall not stand upon the Authority of Men, but *the pure Word of God*. Not one of them in all this time making this obvious Reflection, *that the Protestant Interpreters of*

P R E F A C E.

this pure Word of God are themselves not more than Men, and their Authority not more than human. The first Thing, therefore, that I desire to extort from the Mouth of every Protestant is, a fair Confession, that all the Interpreters of Scripture which they have in their Reformed Churches, whether Ministers or People, *are but Men*, and all of them together not infallible; and that when any of these mistake the Sense of Scripture, their Religion then is no longer built upon *the Word of God*, but upon the Authority of mistaken Men.

Now, that this may really be the Case, and that Protestants, who presume to be the Interpreters of Scripture, may in Fact have mistaken the true Meaning of it, must never be denied by those who make open Profession, that the Gift of Infallibility is in none of their Churches. They may remark too many numerous Societies before them, who had Persons of as *sound Judgment* among them as any of the Reformed Churches, were as good Scripturists, and as well versed in the learned Languages, in which that sacred Book was originally Written, as any the Protestants of our own times can boast of, and yet mistook the Sense of Scripture, and fell into Errours against what Protestants themselves

P R E F A C E.

xi

themselves term the Fundamentals of Christianity, as the *Sabellians*, *Arians*, *Macedonians* formerly, and of late the *Socinians* into Errours against the Trinity: The *Nestorians*, *Eutychians* and *Monothelites*, into Errours against the Incarnation, *Pelagians* into Errours against Grace and Original Sin, &c. These and many other Sects fell into the most intolerable Errours, not for want of Learning or Industry in the Study of Scripture, but meerly by following a wrong and fallacious Rule of Faith, the same Rule which Protestants follow; *The Written Word of God, as understood by every Man of sound Judgment*, as, without Question, every one of them thought theirs to be.

What Security shall Protestants of our own Times give, that they are not guilty of the like Miscarriages, in their Interpretations of the Sacred Text? I know of no Security they can give. For in the first place, it would be excessively ridiculous in any one Sect of Protestants to prefer themselves, as to the Gift of Understanding, before all the rest who dissent from them, or pretend, that *sound Judgment* is entirely confined to their Party, there being no grounds imaginable, why those who belong to one Reformed Church more than another

another, should think that they have better Talents, either Natural or Supernatural, than their Brethren, for understanding Holy Writ. At the same time too, all of them unanimously agree, that the Gift of Infallibility is among none of them. And should it be pretended by any of them, that they have, by the Means of Prayer, obtained *the Gift of interpreting Scripture*; this Pretence too must seem highly ridiculous, since we know that every Sect of them pretends to Pray without intermission for this Gift; and yet have hitherto obtained no other Gift but that of contradicting each others Interpretation. Nor do I know of any Promise God has made, that every private Man and Woman among the Laity, who shall pray for the Gift of interpreting Scripture, shall be infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost to the true Sense of it: Nor have I Faith to believe, that they who have first made a stubborn Resistance against that Church, which Christ commanded them to hear under pain of being accounted Heathens, should afterwards petition Heaven, and find such favour there, as to obtain an extraordinary Gift of the Holy Ghost, to become inspired Interpreters of Scripture, and infallible Oracles. *The Gift of interpreting, the Word of Knowledge.*

Knowledge, the Word of Wisdom, are extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, which are given in the Church to some, for the Sanctification of others, like the Gift of working *Miracles* and *Prophecy*, which are not to be ordinarily obtained by Prayer, or by any other Means, but by the absolute Will of God: And altho' some Person should assure me, that he has prayed half his Life for the gift of Prophecy, I shall not thenceforward conclude, that such a one will certainly be a Prophet, some time or other before he dies, any more, than that every Protestant who pretends to pray for the Gift of interpreting Scripture will of course become an Oracle. I hope then that Protestants of every Sect will be so ingenuous as to own at least the *Possibility* of their mistaking the Sense of Scripture, since they can pretend to no better Talents, either Natural or Supernatural, for expounding Scripture, than other numerous Sects who have erred before them; nor have they any Assurance from the Promises of God, nor any kind of Security either from their own Industry, or from their Churches Veracity, that they do not *actually* err in their Interpretation of those Sacred Oracles.

Protestants

Protestants being thus clearly convicted of the Possibility of their mistaking the Sense of Scripture, they will, I hope abate something of that *exaltation* that immense Esteem and Fondness for their own private Judgment, which has hitherto been so remarkable in them, and no longer with Scorn reject the kind Informations offered them by their Catholick Friends, thro' a Pretence of absolute Certainty, that they are already in the right, and that being *all taught of God* they have no need of being farther instructed by any Men. For in the first place the Reformed Churches all teaching Contradictories to one another, have made it evidently appear, that they are not *all taught of God*: And since there is neither Infallibility in any one of their Churches, nor Evidence in the things they believe, nor have they received any new Revelation from God, nor is there better Understanding in themselves than in others who dissent from them; since their pretended absolute Certainty is thus destitute of all the Grounds of Certainty, and contrary to the Principles of their own Religion which disclaims Infallibility, true Certainty it cannot be, and they must pardon us if what they call their Certainty we term their Self-conceits and

exaltation
self love

Isaiah c.
liv. v. 13.

and Self-wills, or their strong Prejudice; or their Partiality for a Religion which they have once espoused and made their own, or their obstinate Resolution of adhering to their first Choice, without being able to give one good Reason for such their Resolution.

Had Protestants this one Grain of Humility, to own that their own private Judgment is no unerring Guide, and may very possibly have misled them into a mistaken Choice of Religion, this humble Distrust of themselves, might be the Beginning of their entire Conviction. For did they but distrust their former Choice, as their own Conscience informs them they ought to do, since they see it destitute of all Grounds of Certainty, we might then hope they would begin their serious Enquiry after Truth, and I shall not be too bold if I affirm, that a clear Discovery of the Truth will be the Upshot and Conclusion of such their Enquiry. For if it be *the Will of God that all Men should be saved and come to the Knowledge of Truth*, then may we conclude, that there is certainly Evidence sufficient on the side of the true Religion, to convince every humble and sincere Person who searches after it with Candour; tho' not such Evidence as to force the Under-
standing

1 Tim. c.
ii. v. 4.

standing of every obstinate and Self-willed Man: Providence having so ordered it, that the true Religion may be revealed to the humble and sincere, at the same time *Matth. c. xi. v. 25.* those who are proud and wise in their own Opinion, do by their Pride and Obstinacy conceal it from themselves.

I wish all who are out of the true Church would seriously consider what were formerly the Reasons and Causes of the Infidelity of the *Jews*, when our Saviour preached the Gospel among them; these are clearly set down in Scripture and we have them from our Saviour's own Mouth, and perhaps upon a strict Enquiry, it will be found, that the very same Motives do at this Day influence Hereticks to disbelieve the true Religion, which influenced the *Jews* to disbelieve the Truth himself In-

John c. viii. v. 47. carnate. *He that is of God, (says our Saviour to them) heareth the Words of God, ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not*

John c. vii. v. 17. of God. — *If any Man will do the Will of God he shall know of my Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.* — *How can ye believe who re-*

John c. v. v. 44. *ceive Honour one of another, and seek not the Honour that cometh from God only.* —

Remarkable Words! Which do not im-

pute
time do not esteem every protestant
a heretick, as they say who are our enemies,
but only such as know the truth and do

pute the Infidelity of these People to any Defect of their Understanding, but to the Perverseness of their Wills, to the Wick- edness of their Lives, to a bad Heart.

First Cause of the Infidelity of the *Jews*: *He that is of God heareth the Words of God, ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.* Whenever the true Faith is proposed to Infidels, accompanied with such Evidence in the Proofs of it, as God in his Wisdom knows to be sufficient for the Conviction of all who are sincere, if others believe it not, the Reason of their Infide- lity is here plainly told, *because they are not of God.* Now, in another part of Scripture we are told, that *every one who is not just or righteous is not of God, but of the Devil;* 1 John c. iii. v. 10. what Wonder then if such as these, who v. 8. are neither just in Act nor Desire, do not hearken to the true Religion, which, being from God, teaches nothing but Sanctity and the purest Morals?

Second Cause of the Infidelity of the *Jews*: *If any Man will do his Will (the Will of God) he shall know of my Doc- trine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.* When such is the Case, that Men are Reprobates in Grain, who neither desire to do the Will of God or to know

know it, if two Religions are proposed to their Choice, one requiring strict Virtue, continual Devotion, Confession of Sins to a Priest, Satisfaction for Sin by the Punishment of the Sinner's own Person, Mortification of the Flesh, and Abnegation of the Will, with all the Restraints that curb the corrupt Nature of Man from Sin; the other taking off all these Restraints; never doubt, they will not long remain in Suspense between the two, but without Hesitation, and even with Zeal, will declare for that Religion; and call it a *holy Religion* too, which allows them the Liberty both of believing and practising *no Religion at all.*

Third Cause of the Infidelity of the *Jews: How can ye believe who receive Honour one of another, and seek not the Honour that cometh from God only.* When Men are ambitious, and it is their Lot to live in a Nation where all the worldly Honours are on the side of a false Religion, it is no rash Judgment to say, that in such Circumstances, they will be apt to take a strong Bias against the true one, in a Country where Preferments are proposed as a Recompense for those who can say the most against it: And altho' many of them may be so far Disciples of Truth, as to believe
it

it in their Hearts, few will become Martyrs for it; like those unhappy Princes of the Jews, who believed in Christ but did John c. not confess him for fear of the Pharisees, xii. v. 42. that they might not lose their places in the Synagogue. Because they loved the Praise of v. 43. Men more than the Glory of God.

Whatever then is pretended, if Truth may be spoke, these are the true Reasons at the bottom of all Infidelity. The hopes of having a greater Share of those things which are the Objects of *Concupiscence of the Flesh, Concupiscence of the Eyes and the Pride of Life*, is what has determined many in this Kingdom to forsake the Religion of their Ancestors, because a greater Portion of these Objects of their Desires might be enjoyed in another Communion. These, as a certain Catholick Writer long ago observed, are the Sirens which invite and stop many in their way, and divert them from all farther Enquiry after Truth, the Riches, the Honours, and Pleasures of the World; and the contraries of these, Poverty, Disgrace, and Suffering, are the Giants, *the Sons of Enac* which have frightned many from entering into the Land of Promise. Numb. c. xiii. v. 23.

If any are yet remaining among Protestants (and I hope many such there are) who

who are engaged in Errour meerly thro' Mistake, whom we hope will one Day be converted to the Church of Christ on Earth, and be forever in the Church Triumphant, let them know this Truth: That tho' there are many Religions professed among us under the general Denomination of Christianity, yet it is a Matter of the greatest Consequence, which of these they make Choice of for themselves to live and die in, since their eternal Salvation will certainly depend upon the Choice they make of a good or bad Religion. For to imagin that they may be saved alike in all these Religions, and that every Religion is good to him that believes it good, and the right to him that believes it the right, is an Errour so plain, so palpable, so unreasonable, so impious, abominable, injurious to Religion, and so incredible in itself, that it never entered into the Thoughts of any, either Catholicks or Hereticks, before Protestants. And tho' it be a reigning Errour in this Country, one would think it impossible to be believed by any other than those, who having thrown off the Belief of all revealed Religion, conclude, that all Religions are indifferent, because there is none true. In reality to think that you may be saved alike in any of these

these Religions, is setting the Right and the Wrong, Truth and Falshood upon the same level, as if there were no Difference between one and the other, no more intrinsic Worth and Goodness in the true Religion, which all fides who call themselves Christians must confess to be from the God of Truth, than in false ones, which all must own to be from the Father of Lies.

When the true Faith, of which we now dispute, was taught by our Saviour Christ, it then consisted of those Articles of revealed Truth which were necessary for the World to know in order to eternal Bliss; the Sacraments also, which were by him instituted, were then believed to be necessary for the Salvation of Mankind; this one true Faith, the Apostles fully instructed by Christ, were commanded to carry by their preaching into all Nations, teaching them to believe all things whatsoever he had taught, with this terrible Threat, that they *who believe not* Mark c. *shall be dammed.* Go ye into all the World xvi. v. 15. *and preach the Gospel to every Creature.* Teach all Nations baptizing them, In the Matth. c. Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of xxviii. v. the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all 19. things whatsoever I have commanded you. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, Mark c. xvi. v. 16. but

but he that believeth not shall be damned. Now, it being evident there was but *one* true Faith taught by Christ and his Apostles, it follows, that all Sects that have made their Appearance in the World since their times, are false Religions, and no better than Corruptions of that *one true one*. And tho' they call themselves Christians, yet because they do *not observe all things which Christ commanded*, but only *some things*, with Exclusion of others, which were also by him commanded: Nor do they believe *all that he Taught*, but only *some Things*, with Exclusion of others, which were also by him Taught; they cannot but fall under his Anathema, *he that Believeth not shall be Damned*. And inasmuch as every one of them makes an opposition against the Truth, against that Faith which Christ taught in some Article or other, they cannot but be false and impious; and inasmuch as they are false and make Opposition to that which God has taught, they ought not to be excused by the soft Name of *unavoidable Mistakes* and *pardonable Errours* that proceed from the meer Weakness of human Understanding, but they are *pernicious and damnable Errours*, which could come from no other but from the Father of Lies, from the *Spirits of Error*,

Errour, from the Doctrines of Demons, from Satan who has no other intent thereby but to involve multitudes in eternal Perdition.

This I hope may be sufficient for the Present ^{1 Tim. c.} to convince Protestants, that they cannot ^{iv. v. 1.} be saved alike in all Religions; and that it being self-evident *there is but one true one from God*, they ought to give themselves no rest till they have enquired it out, and settled themselves in the firm Belief and Profession of it.

Now, there is one Method to know this as easy as it is certain and infallible, which is, to believe and obey the true Church as Christ commanded: For if the true Church be the Congregation of all the Faithful or true Believers, and nothing can make true Be- ^{Matth. c.} lievers but the Profession of the true Faith ^{xviii. v.} and Law of Christ, it follows, that where ^{18.} the true Church is, there is also the true Faith, the true Scriptures, the true Sense of Scripture, and the whole Tradition of the true Religion. If the Question be returned by Protestants, how they may with Certainty know which is this true Church, among so many which at present pretend to Honour themselves with that Name? We answer, that God has made it as visible and conspicuous to their Eyes, as *a Mountain upon the Top of a Mountain:*

Isaiab c.
ii. v. 2.

Mountain: For tho' all Sects call themselves the true Church, yet is it a thing very well known even to the most ignorant, that there is still one Church which is more antient than all others, which never departed from any more antient than itself, and out of which all other Sects have departed, which was called *Catholick*, even by the Apostles, as appears in their Creed, and is known throughout the World by the same honourable Title at this Day. This was the first Apostolical Church to which all agree the true Faith was at first taught by Christ and his Apostles. If Protestants return the Question again, how they may with Certainty know, that this most antient, Apostolical, Catholick Church to which the true Faith was at first taught, has never since that time corrupted the Doctrine of the Apostles, but has brought it down in all its Purity to our Times? I answer, that they may know from Truth himself who has fully assured us in Words as plain as ever were spoken from his Mouth; That *the Spirit of Truth has ever been in it:* That *himself has always been with it:* That *the Gates of Hell have never prevailed against it.* Thus might Protestants know with absolute Certainty where the true Church is, and consequently where the true

John c.
xiv. v. 16.
Matth. c.
xxviii. v.
20.
Matth. c.
xvi. v. 18.

true Faith and Religion, is by a Method as easy as it is Infallible.

But since their Guides have persuaded them to appeal from the Church to *the Written Word*, we will for the present put their Religion to the Tryal of *the Written Word*, which they have appealed to; we, in this, following the Example of the Doctors of the Church who never failed to cite Scripture against those who denied the Authority of the Church and Tradition, well knowing that the Scriptures, rightly understood, lead to the Belief of the true Church, and the true Church to the Belief of all other Points of Faith. Besides, altho' all particular Controversies cannot be ended by the *Written Word*, because *the Written Word* itself proves, that the whole Truth which Christ and the Apostles taught is *not written*, certain it is however, that nothing is therein written but Truth, and therefore if we can prove to Protestants that their Religion is contrary to *the Written Word*, which themselves have appealed to, from all other Men and Writings, we hope this will be sufficient for their Conviction. With this View this small Treatise was penned; and I hope they will not reject that with Scorn, which

was intended with pure Good-will to serve them. I shall condescend even so far to them as to cite the Scriptures Word for Word, according to their own Translation, that they may read the Condemnation of their Errours in their own Bible.

But what good, you'll say, can be expected from a Scripture-dispute, against those who profess to follow their own private Judgment in the Interpretation of every Text that can be cited against their Sentiments?

Tertull. l. 1. "Who will assume a right of denying
dePrescrip. "what you affirm, and of affirming what
c. 17. "you deny?"

This Maxim of *Tertullian* is indeed very true in regard of the obstinate Part of our Adversaries, but not in regard of such who are engaged in Errour thro' meer Mistake, and are already so far Friends to Truth, as to enquire after it with a sincere Intention to submit to it, as soon as it shall appear to them in a clear Light; from the good Dispositions of these, better Success may be expected. As to the obstinate and perverse Part, who seem to have taken their final Resolution, like the fallen Angels, to adhere for ever to the Party they have once chosen, for such, no kind of Evidence that
we

we know of, is sufficient, and therefore we conclude it will be but time lost to dispute with them.

To conclude, if we admit the worst, that our Scripture Arguments will be lost upon many Protestants, they will be at least an Apology for Roman Catholicks, and such a kind of Apology as no Protestant can in justice to his own Principles refuse to admit. For should their Guides pretend, as doubtless they will, that they can find another Interpretation for all the Texts we cite against them, and will strongly assure their People, that their Interpretation is right and ours wrong, this is no just Exception against the Religion of Roman Catholicks; for so long as we in our Hearts believe our Interpretation of Scripture right, we are licensed by their own Principles to follow it, because the Reformation allows to all People an equal right, which no Authority on Earth can deprive them of, to interpret Scripture for themselves: And whether their Interpretation, which is only the Result of *private Judgment*, or ours which is the *publick* Interpretation of the whole Church, be the truest and the best, that, we are content for the present to

refer to unbiassed Persons. In the mean time let Protestants consider of an Answer to this Question: Whether according to their Principles who maintain, that a Right to follow Scripture, as understood by every Person of sound Judgment, is the very Essence of Liberty of Conscience, whether, I say, it is not Tyranny in them to persecute Roman Catholicks, meerly for following a Religion, which they in the Uprightness of their Hearts and Conscience believe to be clearly grounded in *the Written Word of God*, as understood by Persons of the soundest Judgment the Pastors and Doctors of the Church in all Ages.



CONTENTS.

C O N T E N T S.

PPOINT I. *Protestants hold, That the Holy Scriptures are clear and easy to be understood in all things necessary to Salvation.* Page 1

Point II. *Protestants maintain, That the Doctrine of our Saviour and the Apostles, as to all necessary Points, is fully contained in the Written Word.* 3

Point III. *Protestants hold, That every private Man and Woman among the Laity, has a right, to judge of the Sense of Scripture and to interpret it for themselves.* 8

Point IV. *Protestants hold, That in Controversies and Disputes of Religion we are not bound to submit to the Judgment of the Pastors of the Church.* 12

Point V. *Protestants maintain, That we cannot safely rely upon the Judgment of the Church and of General Councils in Controversies of Faith or Morals.* 21

Point VI. *Protestants maintain, That the whole Church of Christ not only may Err, but also, that it hath Erred in Fact, &c.* 27

Point VII. *Protestants hold, That the Church of Rome, is rightly judged to be the Whore of Babylon.* 41

Point VIII. *Protestants hold, That the great Antichrist spoken of in Holy Scripture, is the Pope of Rome and his Predecessors, for the last thousand Years and upwards.* 43

Point IX.

C O N T E N T S.

- Point IX. *Protestants hold, That no Privi-
lege or Power was granted by our Saviour
Christ to St. Peter, above the rest of the
Apostles, &c.* Page 50
- Point X. *Protestants hold, That the Saints de-
ceased know not what passes here on Earth,
and that they cannot hear the Petitions, &c.* 54
- Point XI. *Protestants hold, That the holy Re-
liques of our Saviour, or the Bodies and
Reliques of the Saints ought not to be
Honoured, &c.* 66
- Point XII. *Many Protestants hold, That it
is not lawful to keep graven Images or
Pictures of Christ, or of the Saints, &c.* 69
- Point XIII. *Many Protestants hold, That it
is absolutely unlawful to make and keep
in our Churches Images or Pictures of
God, &c.* 74
- Point XIV. *Protestants hold, That there is no
Purgatory or third Place, no middle State
of suffering Souls in the other World, &c.* 76
- Point XV. *Protestants hold, That in the Sa-
crament of the Holy Eucharist, or the Lord's
Supper, the Elements of the Bread and
Wine after Consecration remain still in
their very natural Substances, &c.* 82
- Point XVI. *Protestants hold, That Commu-
nion in one Kind is only half of the Sacra-
ment, not sufficient for Salvation.* 96
- Point XVII. *Protestants hold, That the Holy
Eucharist was ordained by Christ to be
partaken by us only as a Sacrament; nor
can it be offered to God on the Altar as a
propitiatory Sacrifice.* 109
- Point XVIII. *Protestants maintain, That
neither the Apostles, nor those who succeed*

C O N T E N T S.

- to their Office, Power and Jurisdiction, the Bishops and Priests of the Church, have any Power given them from our Saviour Christ to remit Sin.* Page 119
- Point XIX. Protestants hold, That we are to confess our Sins to none but God; and that it is needless to confess to Men. 124
- Point XX. Protestants hold, That Penance entirely consists in a Sorrow for our Sins, and Amendment of Life. 129
- Point XXI. Protestants hold, That the Use of Indulgences was not in the Days of the Apostles, nor has any foundation in Scripture. 131
- Point XXII. Protestants hold, That Confirmation is not, properly speaking, any Sacrament of the New Law, ordained by Christ to give Grace. 136
- Point XXIII. Protestants hold, That Extreme-Union is not one of the Sacraments of the New Law. 138
- Point XXIV. Protestants hold, That Holy Orders is not one of the Sacraments of the New Law ordained by Christ to confer Grace. 141
- Point XXV. Protestants hold, That Marriage is not one of the Sacraments of the New Law that confers sanctifying Grace. 145
- Point XXVI. Protestants maintain, That the Honour which is given to Angels and Saints in the Church of Rome, is no better than Idolatry. 147
- Point XXVII. Protestants maintain, That to esteem certain Places to be Holy, and shew outward Marks of Reverence to such Places

C O N T E N T S.

<i>is one of the Superstitions of the Church of Rome.</i>	Page 154
Point XXVIII. Protestants maintain, That Water, Bread, Oyls, and other Creatures, cannot be, by the Blessings, Prayers, and Consecrations of the Church, sanctified or made more holy than they are by their first Creation.	155
Point XXIX. Protestants hold, That Religious Men and Women who have vowed perpetual Continency, may lawfully Marry.	159
Point XXX. Protestants maintain, That Mortification of the Flesh, and an austere Way of Life, is meer Folly and Superstition.	162
Point XXXI. Protestants hold, That Abstinence and Fasting from certain Meats in Lent, and upon other Fasts commanded by the Church is Folly and Superstition.	164
Point XXXII. Protestants hold, That it is an unlawful Praëctice to perform the publick Service and Liturgy of the Church, in any Tongue but the Vulgar.	184
Point XXXIII. Many Protestants hold, That to be joined in Communion with the true Church is not necessary to Salvation.	194
Conclusion.	210





THE
PROTESTANT'S
TRYAL
BY THE
WRITTEN WORD.



P O I N T I.



PROTESTANTS hold,
That the Holy Scriptures
are clear and easy to be un-
derstood in all things ne-
cessary to Salvation.

Contrary to the exprefs words of Scrip-
ture. *Even as our beloved Brother Paul* ^{2 Pet. c.}
also according to the wisdom given unto ^{iii. v. 15,}
him hath written unto you. As also in ^{16.}
all his Epistles speaking in them of these
B things,

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

things, in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable, wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures unto their own destruction.

That somethings especially in St. Paul's Epistles *are hard to be understood* cannot be denied by Protestants without formally giving the Lye to this Text. It is positively affirmed in the same Text, that *the unlearned and unstable* (who are the Bulk of the People) are apt to mistake the sense as well of St. Paul's Epistles as other parts of Scripture, and that too in things *necessary to Salvation*; otherwise it were not truly said, that they wrest the Scriptures *unto their own destruction*. Here then *the written word* plainly contradicts the first Principle of the Protestant Religion, viz; That the Scriptures are easy to be understood in all Points necessary to Salvation, and that all, whether learned or unlearned of the Laity may safely read and boldly expound them.



POINT

P O I N T II.

PROTESTANTS maintain: That the Doctrine of our Saviour and the Apostles, as to all necessary Points, is fully contained in the *written Word*: Nor is any other to be believed with Divine Faith, tho' delivered down to us by universal Tradition, unless it can be from the *written Word* clearly proved.

Contrary to the *written Word*, which clearly testifies, that all is not written which is to be believed. 1. *Therefore* ^{2 Thess. c.} *Brethren stand fast, and hold the Tra-* ^{ii. v. 15.} *ditions which ye have been taught whether by Word or by our Epistle.*

Does not the Apostle here testify, that he had taught some things by word of mouth which he did not write?

2. *Now we command you Brethren, in* ^{2 Thess. c.} *the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that* ^{iii. v. 6.} *you withdraw yourselves from every Brother that walketh disorderly and not after the Tradition he received of us.*

3. *Now I praise you, Brethren, that* ^{1 Cor. c.} *you remember me in all things, and keep* ^{xi. v. 2.} *the Traditions as I delivered them to you.*

Here again the *written Word* bears witness, that all is not written; and

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

that the Apostle taught many things to his Flock, at *Thessalonica* and *Corinth*, by word of mouth, which are not in his Epistles; which nevertheless he enjoins them to believe, as being of equal authority with what he had written.

2 Tim. c.
ii. v. 2.

4. *Those things which you have heard from me before many Witnesses, entrust them to faithful Men, who are capable to teach others.*

It appears by this Text, that St. Paul, as well as the rest of the Apostles, took the method of Oral Tradition to transmit his Doctrine to all future Ages: First, entrusting it to his Disciple *Timothy*, who was to entrust it to other faithful Men, who without any alteration were to teach it to others, that by this method it might be perpetuated from Predecessors to Successors, from Masters to Disciples to the End of the World; at least there is no appearance from this Text, that it ever was the design of the Apostles, to leave only the *written Word* behind them for the Instruction of all Ages, as Protestants pretend.

Jo. c. xxi.
v. 25.

5. *And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the World itself could not contain the Books that should be written.*

Is it not clear from these words of the Evangelist, that all our Saviour did and taught for the Salvation of Mankind is not written? In short, this Doctrine of Protestants implies a contradiction; for if nothing is to be believed with divine Faith, but what is clearly contained in the *written Word*, then this very thing which Protestants thus boldly affirm, is not to be believed because it is no where to be found in the *written Word*. For where is it written, that the Apostles were either commanded by our Saviour, or had any express Design of their own, to write all that our Saviour and themselves had taught? to write a compleat Body of Divinity containing all Articles, both as to Faith and Morals which they had preached, and which we are to believe? It is plain to the contrary, that Christian Churches were founded, and many Thousands ~~if not Millions~~ of Christians fully instructed in the Faith of Christ by the preaching of the Apostles, before any part of the New Testament was written, and that the different parts of this sacred Book were afterwards penned, not with any set Design to record all and every thing that Christ and the Apostles taught, but as occasion offered,

The PROTESTANT'S *Tryal*

either to confute some new Heresy, or by way of exhortation and admonition to those who had been before instructed in the Faith and worship of Christ. In a word, let the Church of *England* say, whether the following Articles are not to be believed: *viz.* That the Virgin *Mary* was ever Virgin: That the Sabbath was, by divine Authority, translated to the *Sunday*: That the Christian Passover or *Easter* is always to be celebrated on a *Sunday*: That Infants are to be baptized: And that the Baptism of Hereticks is valid: Yet certainly these Articles are not clearly contained in the *written Word*, but Protestants received them from the Tradition of the Church of *Rome*. Nay, I can produce one other capital Point against Protestants of all Sects and Denominations, which they all receive upon the sole Grounds of Tradition, and which themselves must confess is no where contained in the *written Word*: I mean, what Books we are bound to receive for *Holy Writ*; which of all *necessary things*, as the learned *Hooker* observes, is certainly one of the very chiefest for Protestants to know, and yet this Point is confessed impossible for the Scripture itself to teach. For should one Book of
 Scripture

Scripture give Testimony to all the rest, still that Scripture which gives Credit to the rest, will want another Scripture to give credit to it, and so on without End. For which reason the Reformed Churches were forced to receive those Books of Scripture, which they have put into their Canon, from the Tradition of the Church of *Rome*, and can have no other reason imaginable to believe them, true and genuine; but because all Catholick Churches, from the Reformation upwards, believed so before them. Now let Protestant People consider well how fairly they are dealt with by their Instructors; one while being told that they are to believe nothing, but what is clearly contained in the *written Word*; at the same time they are to receive *the written Word itself*, upon the sole grounds of Tradition. What more inconsistent? to receive the Scriptures, from whence they pretend all Religion is derived, from the Tradition of the Catholick Church, at the same time they reject many other Points of Religion taught by that Church, which stand upon the same Grounds with other Points of Tradition, which they receive; and with their belief of Scripture itself? Since it is notorious, that the same Ca-

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

tholick Churches, which in all Ages from the Reformation upward, attested the Books of *Holy Writ* now extant, to be the genuine writings of the Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles; did also attest the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, the lawfulness of *Communion in one Kind*, the *Real Presence*, *Transubstantiation*, &c. to be the genuine Doctrine of the Apostles: And by consequence, Protestants have at least as good reason to believe these Articles to be true, as they have to believe the Scripture itself, now extant, to be the Word of God.

P O I N T III.

PROTESTANTS hold, That every private Man and Woman among the Laity, has a right, which no Authority on Earth can deprive them of, to judge of the sense of Scripture and to interpret it for themselves.

2 Pet. c.i.
v. 20.

Contrary to the express words of Scripture: 1. *Knowing this first, that no Prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the Holy Men of*

of

by the WRITTEN WORD.

9

of God, spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

Protestants themselves confess, that as the Scriptures were not written without the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, so neither can they be rightly interpreted without the Gift of the Holy Ghost: Now this gift is not given to every one. *For to one is given by the Spirit the Word of Wisdom; to another the Word of Knowledge, by the same Spirit. To another Prophecy, &c. All these worketh that one and the self same Spirit, dividing to every Man severally as he will.* From whence we may conclude; that the gift of interpreting Scripture is not a Gift for every one, but chiefly, as we may reasonably suppose, for such as God has given *Apostles, Pastors and Doctors* to his Church. As to Protestant People in particular, it does not appear that they have hitherto been endowed with any other Gift, but that of contradicting each others Interpretation throughout all the Reformed Churches, and this no one will say is the Gift of the Holy Ghost: So that Protestants themselves on the one hand confessing, that the Scriptures cannot be rightly interpreted without the gift of the Holy Ghost, and it being self-evident on the

1 Cor. c.
xii. v. 8.

Ephes. c.
iv. v. 11.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

other hand, that Protestant Churches, from their contradicting one another, have not that Gift, we conclude, that neither their Clergy nor their Laity, have a right to judge of the Sense of Scripture and expound it for themselves.

Acts c.

viii. v. 27.

2. *And he arose and went; and behold a man of Ethyopia, an Eunuch of great authority under Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her Treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship, was returning; and sitting in his Chariot read Esaias the Prophet. Then the Spirit said unto Philip. Go near and join thyself to this Chariot. And Philip ran thither to him, and heard him read Esaias the Prophet, and said, understandest thou what thou readeest? and he said: How can I, except some man should guide me?*

If this *Eunuch* who was a holy Man, and a serious Student of Scripture could not understand it without a Guide, It can be no less than Presumption for every private Man and Woman among Protestants to turn Interpreters of Scripture.

Luke c.

xxiv. v.

27.

3. *And beginning at Moyses and all the Prophets, he expounded to them in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself.*

Then

Then opened he their understanding that v. 54. they might understand the Scriptures.

If the very Disciples of Christ could not understand the Scriptures without an Interpreter; can it be supposed that every private man and Woman amongst Protestants are better enlightned than they were? If the Apostles themselves, did not understand the Holy Scriptures, till our Saviour *opened their understanding*, let this at least teach Protestants, that natural Talents alone are not sufficient for expounding Scripture, unless their *understanding* be, by our Saviour Christ in like manner, *opened*. But no Proof has yet appeared, that our Saviour Christ has in particular opened the Understanding of all Protestants, *that they may understand the Scriptures*, better than other Men: For I am sure, whoever makes our Saviour Christ the Author of all those jarring Interpretations of *Holy Writ*, in which the Reformed Churches and all their Members contradict one another, is one of the most notorious Blasphemers that ever was. Let us conclude: That the Authority, as well of expounding Scripture, as of teaching and instructing the Flock in every point of the Faith and true Worship of Christ, belongs to the Office of those, whom

Ephes. c. iv. v. 11. whom God has given Pastors and Doctors in his Church; to the Successors of the Apostles, not to every private Man and Woman among the Laity.

P O I N T IV.

PROTESTANTS hold, That in Controversies and Disputes of Religion we are not bound to submit to the Judgment of the Pastors of the Church; but the contending Parties ought to consult the Scriptures, and that each Party has a right to decide the Controversy by the *written word*, as each one shall expound it to the best of his judgment.

Contrary to many Texts of the *written Word of God*.

John c. xx. v. 21.

1. *As my Father sent me even so I send you.*

John c. xvii. v. 18.

2. *As thou didst send me into the World, even so I have sent them into the World.*

Matth. c. xxviii. v. 19.

Luke c. x. v. 16.

3. *Go therefore teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

4. *He that beareth you beareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and*

by the WRITTEN WORD.

✱

and he that despiseth me, despiseth him
that sent me.

In other Sciences, not so much the
Authority of the Masters as the Doctrine
they teach is to be regarded, because it
is not Authority but Reason, chiefly that
teaches Truth in Human Sciences. But
as to revealed Truths, these not being
discoverable by Reason they must be
learnt from such Pastors and Doctors
as God has appointed to teach them.
Therefore it pleased God, that their Au-
thority should be very great; even his
own Authority our Saviour committed
to them, and gave the most solemn
Sanction to it that was possible, as the
Texts above cited witness. So that now
in Vindication of the Authority they
come invested with, they rightly style
themselves, *Ambassadors from Christ,*
Dispensers of the Mysteries of God, and
their word the Word of God, the Word
of Christ, God, as it were, speaking by
their Tongues. In consequence whereof
they required a most strict Obedience
from all People to what they taught,
denouncing *Anathema* even to an *Angel*
from Heaven, that shall teach contrary to
their Doctrine. Not like the Pastors of
Protestants who, to please their Flock,
style themselves *Advisers* only, and Coun-
sellors

2 Cor. c.

v. v. 20.

1 Cor. c.

iv. v. 1.

1 Thess. c.

ii. v. 13.

Rom. c. x.

v. 17.

Gal. c. i.

v. 8.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

fellors in Matters of Religion; but as became Apostles vested with the Authority of Christ, they required a sincere Submission from the Flock to their Doctrine, Decisions, and Decrees, which is the very point the Pastors of the Catholick Church now contend for against Protestants.

5. And certain Men which came down from Judæa, taught the Brethren and said, except ye be Circumcised after the manner of Moyses ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small Dissention, and Disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and Elders about this Question. And the Apostles and Elders came together for to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing. Peter rose up and gave judgment, &c.

Here, the *Authority* which the Pastors of the Church have from Christ to judge of Heresy and false Doctrine, and to decide Controversy, shines in its full Lustre, while we see the first Controversy that arose in the primitive Church, not referred to the *private judgment* of the contending Parties; but called before the publick Tribunal of the Apostles and

and Elders, who, with St. Peter at the Head, give judgment upon the matter in Question, and oblige all the Faithful whether Jews or Gentils, to submit and obey their Decision. Now let Protestants consider who in this matter are guided by the *written Word*; we Catholics, who following this Platform of the first Council of *Jerusalem*, carry all Controversies to the Tribunal of the Pastors of the Church; or they who refer to the *private judgment* of the contending Parties.

*Acts c.
xvi. v. 41*

To these Proofs of Scripture Protestants reply: That the Apostles indeed were infallible, and consequently no one might contend with them in a matter of Doctrine. But since their decease, we are to obey none but the *written Word*, which they left behind them for the Instruction of all Ages. But this their Reply is directly contrary to the *written Word*, by which they pretend we ought to be wholly guided. For it is there written.

6. *And he gave some Apostles, and Ephes. c.
some Prophets and some Evangelists: And iv. v. 11,
some Pastors and Teachers: For the per- 12, 13.
fecting of the Saints; for the work
of the Ministry; for the edifying of
the Body of Christ: Till we all come
in*

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

in the Unity of Faith, and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect Man, unto the measure of the Stature of the fulness of Christ: That we henceforth be no more Children; tossed too and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine; by the Sleight of Men, and cunning Craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.

Are we not here plainly taught by the Apostle, that there is an Order of Men, whom God has given for Pastors in his Church, to succeed the Apostles, with like Authority as they had, to feed and govern the Flock of Christ, to decide what is Heresy and what is not, that so the Faithful by obeying the Decisions of their Pastors, may persevere in the Unity of Faith, and not be liable to be seduced from it; and that this Method is to continue as long as there shall be a Church, or Hereticks to impugn it? As to what Protestants therefore pretend, that the Authority, Jurisdiction and Power which Christ gave to the Apostles, of feeding and governing the Flock did not pass to their Successors, it is a meer fancy, the product of the Brains of Enthusiasts, an Opinion as destitute of Reason as it is contrary to Scripture. But Protestants
are

are by Necessity driven into it; since either the Pastors of God's Church must be stripped of all Authority to decide Controversy, or the Reformation which was set up in direct Rebellion to that Authority, must be looked upon as the work of Satan.

7. *If thy Brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy Brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three Witnesses, every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: But if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen-man and a Publican.* Matth. c. xviii. v. 15, 16, 17, 18.

If Protestants, to decline the force of this Sentence, whereby the Son of God has so plainly established the Jurisdiction of his Church for deciding Controversies; if, I say, they should pretend that the words in the Text relate not to Articles of Faith, but only to criminal Matters, to Trespases of one private Man against another. To give them an Answer to this Cavil in the Words of a learned Author; let them consider, " That the greatest and most dangerous

Unerring
Authority
of the
Church.
Sec. ii.
Page 79.

“ rous Trespasses, and which more espe-
“ cially (as being Spiritual Cases)
“ ought to be brought to the Spiritual
“ Court of the Church, are such Of-
“ fences by which the Souls of many,
“ the truth of Religion, and the Unity
“ of the Church are endangered: If
“ then other Trespasses of our Brother,
“ are Matter of Complaint, and of
“ the Church's Cognizance, much more
“ these. And if in those where Faith
“ is not concerned, we are obliged to
“ hear our Church Guides, how much
“ more where Faith was concerned?”

In a word, the Tribunal which Pro-
testants have set up to end Disputes of
Religion, to wit, *the Scripture as each
of the contending Parties shall expound
it to the best of their judgment*, is the
very source where all Controversies take
their Birth? It is a Tribunal, which
has never ended any one Controversy
between them and their Adversaries, nor
even among themselves. For the con-
tending Parties having all an equal right
to judge of the Controversy, by the
written Word, the Dispute can never be
ended till one of the Parties is pre-
vailed on by the other's Reasons to con-
demn themselves. But is it not much
rather to be expected, that each one
will

will give judgment in favour of his own Opinion, and will remain stiff in his own Sentiments? And should all the rest of the World condemn him and his Sect, he being as good a judge of the Controversy as they, has not he as good a right to condemn them again? Thus is Schism irremediable in all the Reformed Churches. For why shall not that be lawful to the *Valentinians*, which was lawful to *Valentinus*? And what was lawful to *Luther*, be lawful to *Lutherans*? and what was lawful to *Calvin*, be lawful to *Calvinists*? That is, to make new Sects and prefer their own judgment before that of all others. For have they not, according to their own Principles, all the same Plea for dissenting from one another? The *Presbyterians* as good a Plea to dissent from the Church of *England*, as the Church of *England* pretended to have to dissent from the Church of *Rome*: The *Independents* as good a Plea to dissent from the *Presbyterians*: And the *Quakers* as good a Plea to dissent from them all? Each one by the Reformation being constituted a sovereign Judge of the Controversy between them and their Adversaries, and each one having passed judgment, that their own Party is in
the

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

the right, and their Adversaries in the wrong.

But to do our Protestants justice, this Tribunal of *private judgment*, is no innovation of theirs, but a point of much higher Antiquity : and in this point it must be owned, their Religion is very antient ; no custom having been more antient from the Beginning of the World, than for the refractory Party in all Disputes, to appeal from the Judgment of lawful Superiors to their own private Judgment : And since the Establishment of the Church of Christ, from the first Heresy to the last, I believe, there was not one but appealed from the Church to the same Tribunal ; *the written Word of God*, of whose Sense themselves were to be judges. And had all Controversies been allowed to be decided by this method, no Article of the Christian Faith, but the Being of a God, had been by this time left ; every other Article of the Creed having been condemned as contrary to the *written Word*, at the Tribunal of private judgment, by one Sect or other. The Trinity, by *Arians* and *Semiarrians* : The Incarnation, by *Nestorians*, and *Eutychians* : the Resurrection, by *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, &c.

2 Tim. c.
ii. v. 17,
18.

POINT

P O I N T V.

PROTESTANTS maintain, That we cannot safely rely upon the judgment of the Church and of General Councils in Controversies of Faith or Morals, because the Pastors of the Church are *but Men* and may Err and may consequently lead us astray, if we pay entire Obedience to their Decisions. Therefore they conclude it to be much safer to adhere only to the *written Word* of God. *As tho' every private Man and Woman among Protestants, who are to be the Interpreters of this written Word, were more than Men and could not Err: Or indeed were not far more likely to Err than the Pastors of the whole Church of Christ, tho' considered only as an illustrious Assembly, even without the Gift of Infallibility.* But we shall now prove this pretence of Protestants, *viz.* that the Church of God may Err, to be expressly, contrary to the Gospel of Christ.

1. *And I say also unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* Matth. c. xvi. v. 18.

IF

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

If the Church of Christ shall at any time fall from the Faith and Doctrine of Christ into damnable Errours, as Protestants pretend it did, then certainly will the Gates of Hell prevail against it: But Christ promised and foretold, that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it; Then, either Christ was a false Prophet, or he will never permit his Church to Err. Suppose it were written in the Gospel, *that the Gates of Hell shall prevail against the Church,* would not Protestants from thence immediately draw this Conclusion? *Therefore the Church will certainly Err.* Now the Gospel teaches the contradictory Proposition; *The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it;* do not Catholicks rightly conclude from hence; *Therefore the Church will never Err?* But even Self-evidence is not sufficient to convince those who are blind, *because they will not see.*

Matth. c. 2. *Go ye therefore and teach all Na-*
 xxviii. v. *tions baptizing them, in the Name of the*
 20. 21. *Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy*
Ghost, teaching them to observe all things
whatsoever I have commanded you; And
lo I am with you always even unto the
end of the World.

I suppose Protestants will grant, that the Apostles by virtue of this Promise of our Saviour were *Infallible*, and that those who heard and obeyed their Doctrine, were fully secured from the danger of erring by following such Guides with whom Christ himself promised *to be at all times*; who tho' he sits at the Right-hand of God in Heaven, is *Head* of the Church on Earth, Head both of the Head and the Members, whom he governs from Heaven itself. Now, it is evident, that this Promise which our Saviour made to his Apostles to be with them at all times, and to assist their Ministry from Heaven till the World shall End, did not regard *only the Apostles*, because they were not to live *to the end of the World*; but, the Promise also reaches to their Successors, the Pastors of the Church, who have succeeded the Apostles in their Function, Jurisdiction, and Office of teaching the Faith and Worship of Christ *to all Nations*. For to those who were sent to *teach all Nations*, the Promise is here evidently made: But these can be no other than the Bishops and Pastors of the Roman Catholick Church; because they are the only *Apostolical Men* next to the Apostles, that have effectually

Ad Collos.

c.i.v. 18.

c.ii, v. 19.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

ally preached the Gospel of Christ to all Nations ; and converted all the Idolaters, that have hitherto been converted : If then the Apostles were *Infallible*, by virtue of this Promise of Christ, it follows, that the Church, in all ages since, has been *Infallible* by virtue of the same Promise, and moreover, that the Church of *Rome* is this *Infallible* Church.

Jo. c. xiv.
v. 16.

3. *And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth.*

Jo. c. xvi.
v. 13.

4. *How be it, when he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will Guide you into all Truth.*

It is true, the Holy Ghost was given and sent not only to the Apostles, but to the Faithful in general for their Sanctification. But here we may remark, that this Divine Guest, is peculiarly promised to the Apostles by the Name of *the Spirit of Truth* ; to signify, that they being appointed Pastors of the Church, were to receive a peculiar Gift of *teaching all Truth*, as it is contrary to Heresy and pernicious Errours ; and by this means, as is by all sides confessed, the Apostles, who were Men, *fallible by Nature*, were however *Infallible by Privilege*, in virtue of the Promise here made

made. Now, This *Spirit of Truth*, was not promised and sent only to the Apostles, but to their Successors also, as may be clearly deduced, First, from the very Words of the Promise, where the Particle *for ever* is inserted; *That he may abide with you for ever*, which certainly carries the Grant here made beyond the Lives of the Apostles; and Secondly, the same thing is plainly taught by *Esaias*, where Prophecying of the Descent of the Holy Ghost to the Church of Christ, he assures us at the same time, that this *Holy Spirit of Truth* shall never more depart out of it. *My Spirit which is upon thee, and my* *Esaias c.*
Words which I have put into thy Mouth, *v. v. 19.*
shall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed's Seed, sayeth the Lord, from henceforth and for ever. Now from hence I argue: They to whom our Saviour Christ promised the *Spirit of Truth* to abide with them for ever, for the very end of teaching and guiding them into all Truth as it is contrary to Heresy and pernicious Errours, can never be permitted by Divine Providence to teach Errours against Faith, and are, what in other words we call *Infallible*. But our Saviour Christ promised and
C sent

sent the Holy Ghost, *The Spirit of Truth*, to his Apostles, and to the Pastors of his Church that succeed in their Places, *to abide with them for ever*, for the very end of *Guiding them into all Truth*; what is to be hence concluded, but that this Church, under the unerring Guidance of the Holy Ghost, and Providence of God, never has in time past, never will in time to come, be permitted to teach any the least Errour against Faith or good Morals?

1 Tim. c.
iii. v. 14,
15.

5. *These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly: but if I tarry long, that thou mayst know, how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.*

That Church which God has established to be the Pillar of Truth, and upholds it in the World, will never be permitted by him to fall into *damnable Errours*, and Apostatize from the Faith of Christ; but the Church of Christ is declared in *Holy Writ*, to be the Pillar and Ground of Truth, established by God to uphold Truth upon Earth: Then never did God in time past, or will in time to come permit this Church to teach Errours against Faith.

This

This great Point being clearly demonstrated from the *written Word of God* more clearly than any other Article of the Christian Faith, That there is an unerring Providence of God over the Church, which has ever preserved it from all Errours; what opinion must they have of themselves and their Guides, who have separated themselves from the Communion of this *Infallible Church* of Christ, upon a supposal of its teaching *damnable Errours* and wanting a Reformation in Faith? Let *all Sects*, *all* in General, remember, that if this Church of Christ were from the Beginning *Infallible*, it follows by a necessary Consequence, that they who are departed from it are Hereticks and Schismaticks in grain.

P O I N T VI.

PROTESTANTS maintain, That the whole Church of Christ *not* only may Err, but also, that it hath Erred in Fact; and was corrupted with *damnable Errours*, *Idolatry*, and *Superstition*, for many Ages before their Reformation; for which reason, they pretend they

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

were obliged in Conscience to depart from this Church, and to go out, as they usually term it, of the midst of Babylon.

Dan. c. ii. v. 44. Contrary to innumerable Texts of their Bible. 1. *And in the Days of these Kings, shall the God of Heaven set up a Kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the Kingdom shall not be left to other People, and it shall break in pieces and consume all these Kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.*

All I ask of Protestants here, is to grant what the Prophet in plain terms foretold; That the *Spiritual Kingdom*, or Church of Christ, is never to be destroyed, but to stand for ever.

Dan. c. vii. v. 13, 14. 2. *I saw in the Night Visions, and behold one like the Son of Man, came with the Clouds of Heaven, and came to the Antient of Days, and they brought him near before him, and there was given him Dominion and Glory, and a Kingdom that all People, Nations, and Languages should serve him; his Dominion is an everlasting Dominion, which shall not pass away, and his Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.*

Here again, the same thing is foretold in terms as plain as before, that the *Spiritual Kingdom of Christ*, is that which shall not be destroyed.

3. He shall be great and called the *Luke c. i.*
 Son of the Higbest, and the Lord God *v. 32, 33.*
 shall give unto him the Throne of his
 Father David, and he shall reign over
 the house of his Father Jacob for ever,
 and of his Kingdom there shall be no
 end.

This Text is so plain and full, that
 I suppose more need not be produced
 from the *Written Word* to convince the
 most obstinate Protestant, that the
 Church of Christ, which according to
 the Style and Phrase of Scripture, is
 his *Spiritual Kingdom*, was, after its
 first Establishment, to stand for ever, and
 can never be overthrown.

To this they reply: That we are
 mistaken if we think they maintain that
 the Church of Christ was ever over-
 thrown: They, on the contrary, pro-
 fess, that the Church was never entirely
 ruined, but even in the Ages foregoing
 the Reformation, they own there was
 a *Christian Church* which taught *Chri-*
stianity; tho' it was *impure*, and *cor-*
rupted with damnable Errours, Idolatry
and Superstition. But I shall prove that
 this Idea which Protestants would give
 the World of a *corrupted Church of*
Christ, is a meer *Ens Rationis*, a meer
 Chimera, a Contradiction in terms.

To make this clearly out, we must consider, that the Church of Christ is different from all other *Moral or Political Bodies of Men*, inasmuch as, the Church is a *Mystical or Spiritual Body*, which essentially consists of true Believers and Adorers of Christ: Now, nothing but the Profession of the true Faith and Worship of Christ makes true Believers; consequently, that Church which has apostatized from the Faith and Doctrine of Christ into *damnable Errours and Idolatry*, and is thereby become *impure and corrupted*, I say, that Church after such Apostacy, is no longer the Church of Christ or any part of his Church, but the Synagogue of Satan. If any one single Person, formerly professing the true Faith, falls afterwards into some damnable Heresy, whatever that Person was before his Fall, he is however after it no longer a Member of the Church of Christ: In like manner, if a whole Nation of People, formerly professing the Faith and Worship of Christ, does afterwards Apostatize from the Faith and Doctrine of Christ, to *Arianism*, for example, *Nestorianism*, or some other damnable Heresy or Idolatry, that Nation, after its Apostacy, is no longer any part of the Church of Christ:

Christ: Then, by a parity of Reason, if the whole Church, as Protestants pretend, did in fact Apostatize from the Faith and Doctrine of Christ, into *damnable Errours, Idolatry and Superstition* for many Ages before their Reformation, it might much more properly be called a *Synagogue of Satan*, than *the Church of Christ*; which, essentially consisting of his true Believers and Worshippers, cannot admit of those impure qualities, of *damnable Errours, Herefy, Idolatry, and Superstition*. If Protestants, therefore, will defend their Reformation, which is built upon a Supposal, that the whole Church before them was corrupted with *damnable Errours*, they must also maintain, that during those dark Ages of Errour and Superstition, which they call *the Midnight of Popery*, there was no Church of Christ at all upon Earth, there being no one Nation, Country, or City that professed his true Faith and Worship for many Ages; and consequently, his Church or Spiritual Kingdom was entirely overthrown: Which is a direct Contradiction to their Bible, where we read that this Spiritual Kingdom of Christ, was, after its first establishment, never more to be destroyed, but to stand for ever, and to

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

see the Downfall of other earthly Kingdoms.

Secondly, This Charge of Idolatry, Superstition and damnable Errours against the Church of Christ, is also contrary to all those Texts of the Bible where we are clearly taught, that the Church of Christ, is by the Grace and Favour of God for ever established in Holiness.

Psal. lxxii.

v. 5.

1. They shall fear thee as long as the Sun and Moon endure, throughout all Generations.

v. 7.

In his Days shall the Righteous flourish, and abundance of Peace so long as the Moon endureth.

According to the Title prefixed to this Psalm in the *English* Protestant Translation, *David* here speaks of the Glory of the Kingdom or Church of Christ. Now, here we read that the Prosperity of his Reign, and the Holiness of the People that adore him in all Nations, shall last as long as the Sun and Moon shall run their Courses in the Heavens, which takes in all Ages to the end of the World.

Esaias c.

ii. v. 2.

2. And it shall come to pass in the last Days, that the Mountain of the Lord's House, shall be established in the top of the Mountains, and shall be exalted above the Hills, and all Nations, shall

*shall flow into it. And the Idols v. 18.
be shall utterly abolish.*

The Title prefixed to this Chapter in the Protestant Bible acknowledges, that *Isaias* here Prophecies of *the coming of Christ's Kingdom*, which all but Jews understand not of a *temporal* but of a *Spiritual Kingdom*, or his Church which consists of true Believers. The Overthrow of Idolatry so plainly marked in this Prophecy, is very remarkable: For since Idolatry was to be overthrown by Christ, and yet this Work was not effected by him in Person whilst upon Earth, now we see this glorious work accomplished by the Catholick Church, whose Apostolical Preachers have converted all the Idolaters that have hitherto been converted, and are daily labouring with Success for the Conversion of the rest in all the Infidel parts of the World, what can be more for the Confusion of Protestants who charge this same Church with Idolatry? For who can believe this Church to be over-run with Idolatry at the very same time, they see it is assisted by the Grace and Power of Christ, to overthrow all the Idols and to break the neck of *Dagon* all the World over?

Esaias c.

xxxv. v.

4. 5.

v. 8.

3. Behold your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense he will come and save you. Then the Eyes of the Blind shall be opened, and the Ears of the Deaf shall be unstopped. And a High-way shall be there, and a Way, and it shall be called the Way of Holiness, the unclean shall not pass over it, but it shall be for those, the Way-faring Men, tho' Fools shall not err therein.

The Title of this Chapter in the English Protestant Bible is; *The joyful flourishing of Christ's Kingdom*. Now let Protestants consider how well their accusation of the Church's *Apostacy* agrees with the Character of Holiness, here given to it by the Prophet, who describes it even as *a high Way of Holiness*, a Way that leads so plainly, so easily, so securely to Holiness, that *Way-faring Men*, tho' Fools, tho' ignorant and illiterate, if they will be but guided by it, *shall not err therein*.

Esaias c.

ix. v. 7.

4. Of the Increase of his Government and Peace there shall be no end, upon the Throne of David, and upon his Kingdom, to order it and to establish it with Judgment and with Justice, from henceforth even for ever: The Zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this.

That

That this Chapter is to be Interpreted of the *Spiritual Kingdom* or Church of Christ, the Title of the Chapter in the Protestant Bible witnesses. Now, here in plain terms we read, that this Spiritual Kingdom or Church of Christ, should, from its first establishment, *thenceforth and for ever*, be ordered with *Judgment and with Justice*, with which *Idolatry, Superstition and damnable Errors*, are no more compatible than Fire is with Water, Darkness with Light, or Good with Evil.

5. *And the Redeemer shall come to Esaias c. Zion, and to them that turn from trans-* lix. v. 20.
gression in Jacob, saith the Lord: As ^{21.}
for me this is my Covenant with them: saith the Lord: my Spirit which is upon thee, and my Words which I have put into thy Mouth; shall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy seed; nor out of the Mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.

According to the Title of the Chapter in the Protestant Bible, this is *the Covenant of the Redeemer with his Church*. And can any thing be more for the Confusion of Protestants? For does not the Prophet here in the most significant Language assure us, that the Truth of
our

our Saviour's Doctrine, which he at first taught to his Church, shall never more depart out of it, but shall continue to be professed therein in all its Purity, throughout all Generations? *My Spirit which is upon thee, and my Words which I have put into thy Mouth, shall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of thy Mouth of thy Seed's Seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*

*Jerem. c.
xxxii. v.
31, 32,
Ec.*

6. Behold the Days shall come, saith the Lord, and I will make a new Covenant with the House of Israel, and with the House of Juda: Not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers, in the Day that I took them by the Hand, to bring them out of the Land of Egypt. (*Which my Covenant they brake, altho' I was an Husband unto them, saith the Lord.*) But this shall be the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel (that is, with Christians who are the Spiritual and true Israelites according to St. Paul:)

*Rom. c. iv.
v. 12.
c. ix. v. 6.*

After those Days, saith the Lord; I will put my Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my People.

If this be the essential difference between the old Covenant and the New, that the

the old one was only engraved upon Stone ^{2 Cor. c.}
in Letters, but the New is *written in* ^{iii. v. 7.}
the Hearts of the faithful by the Grace
of the Holy Ghost, and if this new
Covenant is *an everlasting Covenant*, ^{c. xxxvii.}
as the Prophet *Ezekiel* assures us it is; ^{v. 24.}
it follows, that there never can be such
a total Apostacy of Christians from the
Law and Doctrine of Christ, as Pro-
testants pretends; because it is *written in*
their very Hearts by Grace to prevent
this very Apostacy. If Protestants reply,
that the application of Prophecies is an
arbitrary thing, and that we have no
Authority thus to fix the Sense of the
Prophecy here cited; to cut off their
Cavils, let them remember, that these
very Words of *Jeremy* are applied to
the Church of Christ, in two different
places by the Apostle, whom Prote-
stants must allow to be a good Interpreter
of the Prophet.

Heb. c.
viii. v. 10.
c. x. v.
16.

7. *And David my Servant shall be*
King over them, and they shall have one
Shepherd; They shall also walk in my
Judgments, and observe my Statutes and
do them. Moreover, I will make a Co-
venant of Peace with them, and I will
place them, and multiply them; and will
set my Sanctuary in the midst of them
for evermore.

Ezech. c.
xxxvii. v.
24, &c.

All

All Protestants own, that greater and better Promises are made to the Church of Christ, than formerly to the Synagogue; nevertheless they pretend, that the Promises made to the Church, are only *Conditional*: viz. That God will never withdraw his Protection and kind Providence from the Church, so long as the Church shall continue in obedience to Him. But here we may take notice, that, supposing the Promises made to the Church are *Conditional*, Grace is at the same time Promised, whereby the Condition itself shall be effectually performed: As in the Words now cited, God promises to the People in general who live under the New Law, Grace whereby they shall effectually keep his Commandments: *They shall walk in my Judgments, and observe my Statutes and do them*: Which tho' not verified in every Member of the Church, is however verified at all times by the good, who are the more noble part of the Church: Now such a Promise, tho' conditional, if Grace is Promised too to perform the Condition, amounts to an absolute Promise of God, that the Church of Christ shall never Apostatize from him. For a Confirmation of this Belief, he has promised to *set his Sanctuary*

ary in the midst of the Church for evermore: Proof sufficient that the Church was never corrupted with damnable Errours, and become the Kingdom of Antichrist: For can it be true that God has placed his Sanctuary in the Kingdom of Antichrist for evermore?

Now let Protestants compare what the Prophets here say of the Holiness of the Church of Christ, with that hideous Idea which themselves have of the State the whole Christian Church was in before their Reformation, when they imagine whole Christendom was over-run with Idolatry and Superstition; and then let them shew us how these Prophecies were verified during the Church's *Apostacy*, which according to them, began very soon after the decease of the Apostles, and continued down to *Luther*. And yet unless they can clearly make out this dreadful Charge against the whole Christian Church, viz: *That it did Apostatize from the Faith and Doctrine of Christ into damnable Errours, Idolatry, and Superstition*; unless, I say, this Charge can be made out, their Reformation cannot possibly stand, because it is built upon this very Supposal, that the whole Christian Church, which was before them, had been

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

been thus corrupted for many Ages. And therefore if this total Apostacy of the Church of Christ be not true and real Fact (which nevertheless the *written Word of God* proves to be the wildest Chimera that ever entered into disordered Brains.) If, I say, this their Charge against the whole Christian Church be not true, they could have no cause imaginable for separating themselves from it; and must acknowledge themselves to be at this Day in a frightful State of Heresy and Schism; which, if wicked at the first setting up, is not grown more innocent since that time by the long Continuance of it: For Constancy in Evil does not lessen but increase the Blame; and if those did ill who began it, they cannot be innocent who continue it on, and by their invincible Obstinacy, with all their might endeavour still to add Strength to the Schism: And not only the Ringleaders, but their Followers too, have Reason to tremble at the Consequences of being engaged in so wicked a Course; for

Rom. c. i. not only those who do Evil, but those
v. 32. also who consent to the Doers of it, will undoubtedly be Sharers with them both in the Guilt and the Punishment.

POINT

P O I N T VII.

PROTESTANTS hold, That the Church of *Rome*, tho' once the true Church of Christ, was become so impure and corrupt in her Doctrine when the Reformation set out, that she is rightly judged to be *the Whore of Babylon*, mentioned by St. John in the Revelations, *who hath made all Kings* Rev. xvii. v. 1, 2. *of the Earth, and all People drunk with the Wine of her Fornication.*

Contrary to the exprefs words of their own Bible: *And I will betroth thee* Hosea. c. ii. v. 19. *unto me for ever. Yea I will betroth thee unto me in Righteousness, and in Judgment, and in loving Kindness, and in Mercies: I will even betroth thee unto me in Faithfulness; and thou shalt know the Lord.*

So God speaks of the Church by the Mouth of the Prophet *Hosea*: Now, before the Reformation, we know of no other Catholick Church on Earth but that which held Communion with *Rome*, called the *Roman Catholick Church*: And can it be believed by any but *Atheists*, that this Spouse of Christ, whom God has *betrothed to himself in Righteousness and in faithfulness* for

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

for ever, is at length become *the Harlot of the Apocalypse?*

*Ephes. c.
v. v. 24,
25.*

2. Therefore, as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let Wives be to their own Husbands in every thing. Husbands love your Wives even as Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it: That he might sanctify and cleanse it, by the washing of Water by the Word. That he might present it to himself a glorious Church not having Spot or Wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without Blemish.

Now let Protestants compare the Description which St. Paul has here given of the Beloved Spouse of Christ, *holy, without Spot, without Blemish*; with the Description given by St. John, in the Revelations, of the Whore of Babylon, and try whether these two Descriptions when they are understood of the same Church, can stand together in the same Brain not cracked.

P O I N T VIII.

PROTESTANTS hold, That the great Antichrist spoken of in Holy Scripture, is the Pope of Rome and his Pre-

Predecessors, who have sat in St. Peter's Chair, for the last thousand Years and upwards.

Contrary to many clear Texts both of their Bible and Testament.

1. *Let no man deceive you by any means, for that Day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that Man of Sin be revealed the Son of Perdition.* ^{2 Thess. c. 1. ii. v. 3.}

We find by this Text, that the great Antichrist is one single Person, one egregious Impostor, who by the Apostle is styled *the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition*; how ridiculous then are they who make the great Antichrist to be a long Succession of Popes, or a whole Body of false Doctors!

2. *Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that he is God?* ^{v. 4.}

Let Protestants say, which of the Popes for the last thousand Years or upwards, did declare himself to be God? If no such thing was ever heard of, then none of the Popes is Antichrist, who according to the Character here given of him, will *exalt himself above all*

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

all that is called God, and sit in the Temple to be adored as God.

1 Jo. c. ii.
v. 22.

3. *Who is a Liar but he that denieth that Jesus is Christ? He is the Antichrist that denyeth the Father and the Son.*

But, none of the Popes of the last thousand Years and upwards, did ever deny either the Son or the Father: Or ever questioned whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or Christ: Then none of these Popes was Antichrist.

1 Jo. c. ii.
v. 18.

4. *Little Children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now there are many Antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last time.*

As for the Antichrists here mentioned who were come in St. John's time, the Popes of Rome they could not be; unless you say, that St. Peter and his immediate Successors, who all suffered Martyrdom for the Faith of Christ, and who were the Popes or Bishops of Rome in St. John's time, were Antichrists. Who then were the Antichrists that St. John speaks of? who should they be but the Hereticks of his time who opposed the Doctrine of the Apostolical Church? These by St. John are styled *Antichrists*, for so much

much as they were Precursors of the great Antichrist, and Types of him. Therefore does St. John in the very next Verse say of them: *But they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have continued with us, but they went out, that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us.* v. 19.

5. And every Spirit that confesseth not, that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, is not of God; And this is that Spirit of Antichrist, whereof you have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the World. Jo. c. iv. v. 3.

But, no one of the Popes or Bishops of Rome that lived in St. John's time, not St. Peter, I hope, nor St. Clement or any of his immediate Successors, nor any other of the Popes since, that we have heard of, *did deny that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh*, or that Jesus, was Christ, the Messiah, the Son of God Incarnate: Then none of the Popes are the Antichrists mentioned by St. John: But the Persons who are stigmatized by this Apostle with the odious Name of Antichrists, are the Hereticks of those times who denied Jesus to be the Son of God Incarnate, or the Messiah: These were Forerunners of the great

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

*Jo. c. v.
v. 43.* great Antichrist, who very probably will teach the same Doctrine, proclaiming himself to be the Messiah, as our Saviour himself seems to intimate.

*Dan. c.
xi. v. 36,
37.* 6. *And the King (Antichrist) shall do according to his will, and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every God, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of Gods: And shall prosper till the Indignation be accomplished: for that which is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his Fathers. Nor regard any God: For he shall magnify himself above all.*

According to Protestants, this is said of Antichrist: Now let them name, which of the Popes of Rome, has denied the God of his Forefathers? Or magnified himself above every God? Or spoke against the God of Gods? If none of the Popes have done this, then we are absolutely certain none of the Popes were Antichrist.

*2 Theff. c.
ii. v. 9.
Rev. c.
xiii. v. 13.
v. 15.* 7. *Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all Power, and Signs, and lying Wonders: And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire to come aown from Heaven on the Earth in the sight of Men. And he had power to give life unto the Image of*

of the Beast, that the Image should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast, should be killed.

According to Holy Scripture, these are the Signs and Prodigies, which will be done by the great Antichrist; but not one of the Popes of Rome have yet done any Prodigies like these: Then, none of the Popes are Antichrist.

8. *And I will give power unto my two Witnesses, and they shall Prophecy a thousand two hundred and threescore Days, clothed in Sack-cloth. And when they shall have finished their Testimony, the Beast that Ascendeth out of the bottomless Pit, shall make War against them; and shall overcome them and kill them.* Rev. c. xi. v. 3.

The Holy Scripture here inform us, that toward the end of the World, two great Prophets (*Enoch* and *Elias*) will be sent, clothed in Sackcloth to preach and work Miracles against Antichrist, for the space of *one thousand two hundred and threescore Days*, at the end of which term, the two Prophets are to be slain by the Beast, and to suffer Martyrdom: Now let Protestants say, which of the Popes is the Beast that has slain the two Prophets *Enoch* and *Elias*:

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

Elias: Or if this extraordinary thing has never yet been done; we may rest satisfied, and conclude, that none of the Popes is Antichrist.

From the Texts above cited, it is plain even to Demonstration, that the great Antichrist who is mentioned by St. *John* in his first Epistle, and in the *Revelations*; as also by St. *Paul* in his second, to the *Thessalonians*; and by the Prophet *Daniel*; never yet sat in St. *Peter's* Chair at *Rome*. Could we but learn what was the famous Medicine for the Brain, which the Townsmen of *Democritus* formerly sent to that Philosopher, when they heard he was, in Imagination, building the Structure of this great World out of Atoms, never could it be more properly applied than in the present case to those who imagin Antichrist to be a long Series of the Bishops of *Rome*, Successors of St. *Peter*, who instead of opposing *Christ* as Antichrist will do, have all constantly professed the Faith of *Christ*, great part of whom, one hundred have suffered Martyrdom for *Christ*, who moreover are continually sending Missioners into all parts of the World, to Propagate amongst Infidels the Name of *Christ*; from whom, in a word, almost all Nations of the Christian

2 *Thess.*
c. ii.

Christian World did at first receive their Christianity, *England* in Particular. Those who have ever looked into Scripture, must clearly perceive, that the great Antichrist there mentioned, is one single Person, the greatest of all Impostors who will make his appearance a little before the Day of Judgment; will deny Jesus Christ, and in his place proclaim himself to be the Messiah and God; will do great Prodigies, and reign in great Prosperity for about three Years and a half, persecuting the Church beyond all the Tyrants that went before him. It is true, *St. John* makes mention of some Antichrists that were already come in his time; but his meaning cannot be, that the great Antichrist himself was then come in Person, but only, that he had appeared in his *Pre-cursors*, and such wicked Men as were *Types* of him. Now, by the very Characters he gives of these, we know they could not be the Popes and Bishops of *Rome* that were in *St. John's* time, for these were no other than *St. Peter*, and his immediate Successors who for the first three hundred Years after Christ almost every one suffered Martyrdom for the Faith of Christ: But much rather the Antichrists that were come in

*Belarm.
de Rom.
Pont. c.
xiv. and c.
xii.*

St. *John's* time as *Precursors* of the great Antichrist, were the Hereticks of that Age, especially such as denied our Saviour to be the Messiah, which is the very Doctrine that Antichrist himself will teach in Person. So all the Antients ever understood this matter. Now I appeal to all sober Protestants, whether our Interpretation of Scripture or theirs, in Relation to Antichrist, is the most probable. They will do well at the same time to reflect whether these their monstrous Slanders against the Church of Christ, and the Heads of it, styling one the *Whore of Babylon*, and the other *Antichrist*, are not *damnable Sins*, of which they must give a terrible Account one Day to God: And what opinion they ought to have of a Religion, which by a Principle that is intrinsic and essential to it, teaches all its Followers daily to utter these abominable Slanders.

P O I N T IX.

PROTESTANTS hold, That no Privilege or Power was granted by our Saviour Christ to St. *Peter*, above the
the

the rest of the Apostles, but that they were all equal in Power and Authority : And that the Scriptures reveal no such thing as St. Peter's Supremacy, nor consequently the Supremacy of his Successors the Bishops of Rome.

Contrary to the exprefs Words of the Gospel.

1. *So when they had dined, Jesus* Jo. c. xxi. *saith to Simon Peter, Simon Son of* v. 15, 16. *Jonas, lovest thou me more than these ? He saith unto him, yea Lord, thou knowest that I love thee : He saith unto him, feed my Lambs : He saith to him again the second time : Simon Son of Jonas lovest thou me ? He saith unto him ; yea Lord thou knowest that I love thee, he saith unto him, feed my Sheep.*

2. *And I say unto thee, that thou art* Matth. c. *Peter (or Rock) and upon this Rock I* xvi. v. 18, *will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven ; And whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.*

In the first of these Texts, a Commission is by our Saviour given to St. Peter, of feeding or teaching both the Lambs and the Sheep, which does most

fully comprise the whole Flock of Christ, as well Pastors as People; for of the Lambs and the Sheep the whole Flock is composed.

In the second Text, a Power is given to the same Apostle, of *Ruling* and *Governing* the Flock in Spiritual Matters, which Spiritual Power is expressed by *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*. For, as Doctor *Hammond*, a noted Divine of the Church of *England*, remarks, what is here meant by the Keys, is best understood by *Esaias*, where they signify ruling the whole House or Family of the King, and this being accommodated by Christ to the Church, denotes the Power of governing in it.

In token of this supreme Power given to St. *Peter* by our Saviour, we find him constantly set in the first Place, when ever the Apostles are named in the Gospels: Nay, by St. *Matthew*, he is not only named First, but called *the First*. As a further Confirmation of the same, we find him preaching the Gospel the first of all the Apostles, both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*: The Holy Scripture bearing Evidence, that God who elected St. *Paul* to be the Apostle of the *Gentiles*, made choice of St. *Peter* to be *the Apostle both of Jews and Gentiles*.

Cap. xxii.

v. 22.

Matth. c.

x. v. 2.

Acts c. ii.

v. 14. and

c. 10.

Gal. c. ii.

v. 7.

Gal. c. ii.

v. 8.

Acts c.

xv. v. 7.

Gentiles. I hope this may be sufficient for the present to satisfy Protestants, that the Scriptures are not entirely silent of *St. Peter's* Supremacy. When they produce a Text of the Gospel as clear, where the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are given to temporal Princes, we shall without Scruple of Conscience, then confess them to be Heads of the Church in Spirituals and in Temporals, and the Fountains of all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

Now if the Scripture has revealed *St. Peter's* Supremacy, it has by consequence revealed the Supremacy of the Popes or Bishops of *Rome*, who are the Successors of *St. Peter*, and inherit his Power and Privilege. For it must be granted, that the Powers which were given by our Saviour to *St. Peter*, descend to all his Successors, or we must suppose the Form of Church Government, which Christ originally established, was only to last for *St. Peter's* Life and then to end. But then, if the Powers granted to *St. Peter* were to end with his Life, and not to be transmitted to his Successors; by the same Reason, Quakers and Enthusiasts will say, that the Powers which our Saviour gave to all the Apostles of preaching the Gospel,

Gospel, of Baptizing, of administering the Lord's Supper, of remitting and retaining Sins, expired also with them, and that now there is *no ordinary Pastoral Power* in the Church of Preaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments, but that this Power ended with the Apostles, in like manner as the Supremacy is said to have ended with St. Peter. But if, on the contrary, St. Peter's Power descends to all his Successors, then have the Bishops of *Rome*, who are his undoubted Successors, at this Day, *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*; and a Commission from Christ, to feed both the *Lambs* and the *Sheep*; to *Teach* and to *Rule*, in *Spiritual Matters*, the whole Flock of Christ; both Pastors and People, Clergy and Laity, Kings and their Subjects; which Protestants must either confess or deny one of the plainest Truths in the Gospel.

P O I N T X.

PROTESTANTS hold, That the Saints deceased know not what passes here on Earth, and that they cannot hear the Petitions which we address to them

them when we implore their Intercessions.

Contrary to the Gospel. 1. I say *unto you, that likewise joy shall be in Heaven, over one Sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety nine just Persons which need no Repentance. Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the Angels of God over one Sinner that repenteth.* Luke c. xv. v. 7. v. 10.

The Angels in Heaven, therefore, know when a Sinner repents, and the Saints in Heaven also know it; for the Saints in Heaven according to the Gospel are equal to Angels (*ισάγγελοι*) *They are as the Angels of God in Heaven: They are equal unto the Angels.* Matth. c. xxii. v. 30. Luke c. xx. v. 36. But if the Saints and Angels in Heaven, have so clear a Knowledge of the Repentance of Sinners, which, being in the Heart of Man, is one of the most secret and hidden of all things; if, I say, nevertheless God, who is the Searcher of Hearts, reveals this thing to them in the State of Glory, why cannot they, at least by Revelation from God, know our Prayers, when we desire to impart our Thoughts to them, notwithstanding the distance between them and us?

2. *And four and twenty Elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one* Rev. c. v. v. 8.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

of them Harps and golden Vials full of odours which are the Prayers of Saints.

Rev. c.

viii. v. 4.

3: And the Smoke of the Incense, which came with the Prayers of the Saints, ascended up before God out of the Angel's hand.

Here we learn, that the Blessed offer to God not only their own Prayers, but our Prayers too, which they could not possibly do if they knew nothing of them.

Luke c.

xvi. v. 23.

&c.

4. And in Hell he lift up his eyes being in Torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom, and he cryed and said : Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his Finger in Water, and cool my Tongue ; for I am tormented in this Flame. But Abraham said : Son, remember, that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus likewise evil things : But now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you, there is a great gulf fixed, &c.

If this damned Soul knew what passed in that Place where Abraham and Lazarus were, and Abraham could hear him, and he hear and discourse with Abraham, notwithstanding they were afar off, and a great Gulf or Chaos was in-

interposed between them; Protestants may know from hence, that Spirits converse at a distance, and therefore the distance of place between Heaven and Earth, is no Reason why the Saints, that are in Glory, cannot hear the Prayers of those on Earth who implore their Intercession.

5. *Therefore the Heart of the King of Syria was sore troubled for this thing, and he called his Servants and said unto them, will ye not shew me which of us is for the King of Israel? And one of his Servants said: None, my Lord, O King: But Elisha the Prophet, that is in Israel, telleth the King of Israel the Words that thou speakest in thy Bedchamber.* 2 Kings c. vi. v. 11, v. 12,

Let Protestants here observe, that the Prophet *Elisha* (or *Eliseus*) knew what was said by the King of Syria in his private Bedchamber in *Damascus*, at the same time the Prophet was in *Samaria*. It is related also in the same Book of *Kings*, how the same Prophet knew what was said and done at a great distance off by his Servant *Gebasi* and *Naaman Syrus*. 2 Kings c. v. v. 25, 26.

Now if this Prophet knew by the Light of Prophecy what passed at so a great distance from him, then certainly the Saints in Heaven, by

the Light of Glory, may know what passes here on Earth.

Rev. c.

xii. v. 10.

6. And I heard a loud Voice saying in Heaven. Now is come Salvation and Strength, and the Kingdom of our God, and the Power of his Christ; for the Accuser of our Brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God, Day and Night.

This is said of one of the wicked Spirits who accused the Servants of God, Day and Night, and consequently, must be supposed to know what passes in the Conversation of Men upon Earth. Protestants themselves deny not, that the Devils know what is transacted in this World, and that they hear the Supplications of the Magicians their Votaries; but surely, the bad Angels are not more acute in Knowledge than the good Angels; and I hope we may be allowed to attribute as much Knowledge at least to the blessed Spirits, as Protestants do to the wicked Spirits. Let us then conclude, that the Saints and Angels in Heaven, know the contents of our Prayers.

There are two ways of Praying to God by the Intercession of the Saints practised in the Catolick Church: One, when we beseech God to grant our Petitions for the sake of his Saints: The other,

other, when we petition the Saints themselves to intercede with God for us. Protestants oppose both these Practices.

First: They hold: That we ought not to beseech God to grant our Petitions for the sake of his Saints, nor do we receive any Benefit by their Merits.

Contrary to the express Words of their Bible. Remember Abraham, Isaac *Exod. c. xxxii. v. 13.* and Israel, thy Servants to whom thou swearest by thy own self, and saidst unto them. I will multiply your Seed as the Stars of Heaven, and all this Land that I have spoke of, will I give unto your Seed, and they shall inherit it for ever. And the Lord repented of the Evil which *v. 14* he thought to do unto his People.

See here how plainly is written, that Moses prayed to God to spare the Children of Israel, for the sake of the holy Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: The Scripture at the same time bearing witness, that this Prayer of Moses for the Israelites was heard.

2. For I will defend this City, to save *Isaias c. xxxvii. v. 35.* it for my own sake, and for my Servant David's sake.

Here we read, that God protected the holy City of Jerusalem, in the Days of King Ezechias, for the sake of holy David,

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

David, when it was upon the point of being plundered by *Senacherib*: Therefore the Merits of the Saints who are dead, do benefit the living. At the same time we confess, that the Merits of the Saints are acceptable to God through the sole Merits of Christ, who by his Death merited that Grace which made them Saints, and by which they merit the Favour of God, and the Rewards which he has promised.

2. *Chron.*
c. vi. v.
42.

3. *O Lord, turn not away the face of thine anointed, remember the Mercies of David thy Servant.*

So prayed *Salomon* at the Dedication of the Temple, laying before God the Merits of King *David*. So prayed the People of God who lived under the old Law; laying before God the memory of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*; frequently alledging the Merits of their Saints deceased to move God to Mercy, who, as the Scripture itself testifies, for the sake of these holy Patriarchs, did often spare their sinful Posterity.

Secondly, Protestants hold, That it is not lawful to invoke the Saints or Angels, or beg of them to intercede with God for us.

Contrary to the Words of their Bible.

I. *The*

1. *The Angel, which redeemed me from all evil, bless the Lads; and let my Name be named on them, and the Names of my Fathers Abraham and Isaac: And let them grow unto a multitude in the midst of the Earth.* Gen. c. xlviii. v. 16.

We have here an exprefs Warrant from the Word of God, for the Invocation of Angels: And by consequence for the Invocation of Saints.

2. *Then the Angel of the Lord answered and said. O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have Mercy on Jerusalem, and the Cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten Years?* Zach. c. i. v. 12.

This proves, that the holy Angels intercede with God for us; and can it be doubted that the Saints in Heaven do the same? Now if the Saints and Angels in Heaven pray for us, why shall it not be lawful to beg of them to pray for us? Yet we are well assured, that the Church of Rome professes no more by *Invocation of Saints and Angels*; for which most innocent Practice so many Millions of devout Christians, are, by Protestants, accused of Idolatry.

Against this Article of our Faith Protestants object; that to have recourse to the Intercession of the Saints, is

is an injury done to the Mediation of Christ.

Contrary to the Doctrine of the holy Scripture, where we are expressly taught to have recourse to the Prayers and Intercessions of holy Persons. As *Abimelech* had recourse to *Abraham*, and the three Friends of *Job*, to that holy Patriarch to pray for them: And St. *Paul* himself to his Flock; which Protestants think allowable and according to the *written Word*: But most clear it is, that as much injury is done to the Mediatorship of Christ, by praying the living to intercede with God for us, and employing their Mediation, as by praying the Saints deceased to intercede for us. We may then rest satisfied, that it is no injury at all to the Mediatorship of Christ to implore the Intercession of the Saints; because these Saints themselves, whether living or deceased, intercede and pray to God for us *thro' the Mediation of Christ, and not without it*; so that both we and they have *but one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus*.

Protestants reply, That it is a vain thing to employ the Intercessions of the Saints, when we know that God himself is ready to hear our Petitions.

To

To whom we answer ; that this Argument as well proves the unlawfulness of recommending ourselves to the Prayers of the living, as to the Intercession of the Saints deceased. Yet the holy Scripture in many Places authorizes us to recommend ourselves to the Prayers of the living Saints and devout Christians. This St. *Paul* himself frequently did, desire the Prayers of his Flock at *Ephesus*, *Thessalonica*, *Colossus*, and elsewhere. Did this Apostle then do a vain thing in having recourse to the Prayers of the Faithful? Or may we not recommend ourselves to the Prayers of holy Persons, thro' a pretence, that God being ready to hear our Petitions, there is therefore no need of employing the Intercessions of others? Now, if it is not a vain thing to recommend ourselves to the Prayers of the Saints that are living, neither is it a vain thing to recommend ourselves to the Prayers of the Saints deceased. For why I may lawfully desire a holy Person to pray and intercede for me while he is in his mortal Life, but not after he is Glorified, the most subtle Protestant alive will be puzzled to give a good Reason.

Ephes. c.
vi. v. 19.
2 *Thess. c.*
iii. v. 1.
Collos.
c. iv. v. 3.
Rom. c. xv
v. 30.

They return to the charge once more :
That to employ the Intercession of the
Saints

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

Saints is injurious to God, because it seems as if we really believed the Saints would be more merciful and good to us than God; otherwise why do we rather chuse to address ourselves for help to them, than to him who is the Author of all our good, and the Giver of all good Gifts?

This objection, which to Protestants seems so very plausible, is notwithstanding directly contrary to the plain Words of their Bible, as will appear by what follows. *Now, therefore restore the Man his Wife, for he is a Prophet, and shall pray for thee and thou shalt live. So Abraham prayed unto God, and God healed Abimelech and his Wife, and his Maid-servants and they bare Children.*

Job c. lii. v. 7, &c. And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these Words unto Job, the Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite; my Wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two Friends; for ye have not spoken of me the Thing that is right, as my Servant Job hath. Therefore take unto you now seven Bullocks, and seven Rams, and go to my Servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a Burnt-offering; And my Servant Job shall pray for you, for him will I accept, lest I deal with you

you after your Folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the Thing that is right, like my Servant Job.

These Words of God utterly overthrow all Objections of Protestants against the Invocation of Saints. For do we not here read, that God himself sent wicked Men to the Saints to intercede for them? Yet no one pretends to conclude from hence, that these Saints were more eminent in Mercy and Goodness than God himself; but we rather conceive it was through his Mercy, these great Saints were found to intercede for the wicked, and by their Prayers save them from Destruction; through his Mercy it is, that we have such powerful and illustrious Advocates to shield us against his Anger. Even those Sinners who are hardened against all that is Good, and are come to that pitch as to be delighted with the slavery of the Devil, unwilling to go out of it, and therefore cannot be supposed to pray for themselves, have still this relief left, that the Saints and Angels in Heaven, as well as the Servants of God upon Earth, pray zealously for them, and often prevail upon God to touch them with his Grace more powerfully and convert them. And when this happens,

pens, is it not owing to the Mercy of God, that you have some powerful Saint who has more interest at the Court of Heaven, and intercedes for you, when you are past the thought of praying for your own Salvation? If the Question be put, why God, who is infinitely Merciful to us himself, is better pleased to receive Addresses for Sinners from the Saints, than to receive Addresses from Sinners themselves? The holy Scripture gives this Answer, that the Prayers of the Just are more prevalent with God than the Prayers of the Wicked, the order of his Justice so requiring; at the same time his Mercy for the Wicked most eminently appears in sparing them at the Intercession of the Just.

*James c.
v. v. 16.*

P O I N T X I.

PROTESTANTS hold, That the holy Reliques of our Saviour, as the Cross whereon he died, &c. Or the Bodies and Reliques of the Saints ought not to be honoured; and that God does not work Miracles by them.

*Matth. c.
ix. v. 20,
21, &c.*

Contrary to the Gospel. 1. *And loe a Woman that had a bloody flux for twelve*

twelve Years came behind him, and touched the hem of his Garment. For she said to herself; If I only touch the hem of his Garment I shall be cured. And Jesus turning back and seeing her said, be of good heart, Daughter, thy Faith hath made thee whole. And from that time the Woman was cured.

Here a Miracle is wrought in favour of a Woman for devoutly touching a Relique, to wit the Hem of our Saviour's Garment: At the same time he expressly commends her Faith for so doing. Now it is impossible that Christ who is Truth himself, should work a Miracle in favour of an Errour, or that he should commend a Person's Faith, if it were Vain and Superstitious and not true Faith. Then the Faith which Roman Catholicks have in holy Reliques is true Faith.

2. And Elisha died, and they buried ^{2 Kings c.} him, and the Bands of the Moabites ^{xiii. v. 20,} invaded the Land at the coming in of ^{21.} the Year. And it came to pass as they were burying a Man, that behold, they spied a band of Men. And they cast the Man into the Sepulchre of Elisha, and when the Man was let down and touched the Bones of Elisha, he revived and stood up on his Feet.

Does

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

Does not God then work Miracles by the Reliques and dead Bodies of the Saints? But this Text needs no comment; it is, I hope, sufficiently clear of itself to open the Eyes of Protestants, and make them sensible of their Folly, in scoffing at the Saints Reliques.

Acts. c. v. 3. And Believers were more added
to the Lord, multitudes both of Men and
Women. Insomuch that, they brought
forth the Sick into the Streets, and laid
them on Beds and Couches, that, at the
least, the shadow of Peter passing by, might
overshadow some of them.

The holy Scripture here remarks that the primitive Christians had a singular Veneration for the very shadow of *St. Peter's* Body: May not *Roman Catholics* then, without Superstition or Idolatry have as much Veneration for the Body itself of *St. Peter*, now his Soul is in Glory, as those primitive Christians had for the shadow of it?

Acts c. xix. v. 11, 12. 4. And God wrought special Miracles
by the Hands of Paul, so that from his
Body were brought unto the Sick, Han-
kerchiefs or Aprons, and the Diseases de-
parted from them, and the evil Spirits
went out of them.

When God works Miracles at the Shrines of the Saints, either by *their*
dead

by the WRITTEN WORD,
dead Bodies, in the cure of Diseases,
 in the Resurrection of the Dead, &c.
 As he did at the Sepulchre of the Pro-
 phet *Elizeus*; or when he works a
 Miracle *in their dead Bodies*, by pre-
 serving them uncorrupted, we Catho-
 licks think such Miracles to be a Divine
 Attestation of their Sanctity; and any
 Part or Particle of the Saint's Body, or
 what has touched the Body we esteem
 a *Relique*. Now, whether those *Hand-
 kerchiefs and Aprons* which had touched
 the Body of *St. Paul*, mentioned in
 the Text now cited, were not of this
 kind, and how far such Reliques may
 have a Virtue against Diseases and evil
 Spirits, let the plain Words of the Text
 itself inform Protestants. And withal,
 let them consider well, whether their
 Holy Religion, which teaches them to
 scoff at the Reliques of the Saints, does
 in this particular agree with the *writ-
 ten Word of God!*

P O I N T XII.

MANY Protestants hold, That it
 is not lawful to keep graven Images
 or Pictures of Christ, or of the Saints
 and

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

and Angels in our Churches: All Protestants maintain; that to have a Veneration for such Holy Images for the sake of the Prototypes or Parties, who are thereby represented, is absolutely unlawful: Nay, that all such Veneration of Holy Images is Idolatry.

Exod. c.

xxv. v. 18.

Contrary to their Bible. 1. *And thou shalt make two Cherubims of Gold: Of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the Mercy Seat.*

1 Kings.

c. vi. v.

23.

v. 29.

2. *And within the Oracle, he made two Cherubims of Olive tree, each ten Cubits high.*

3. *And he carved all the Walls of the House round about with carved Figures of Cherubims, &c.*

1 Chron.

c. xxxiii.

v. 19.]

4. *All this the Lord made me understand in writing, by his hand upon me, even all the works of this Pattern.*

These Texts which inform us, that there were Holy Images (and that by a pattern from God himself) as well in the Mosaick Tabernacle, as in *Salomon's* Temple, are a sufficient Justification of Roman Catholicks retaining and keeping Holy Images, in their Churches, Oratories, and Houses, which pious Practice, we see, is clearly grounded on the *written Word of God.*

From

by the WRITTEN WORD.

71

From the same Texts we may gather that these Words (*Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing, nor the likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Waters under the Earth thou shalt not bow down nor worship them:*) I say, it is plain from the Texts above cited, that these words in their true meaning, did only forbid the making and worshipping of Idols, or Images of false Gods, such as were adored at that time by the Heathens; but the use of *Holy Images* were not forbidden, otherwise the carved Cherubims had never been set up in the very Temple of God by his own Command.

The Doctrine of the *Roman Catholic Church* concerning *Holy Images* consists in two Points, and is fully expressed in these Words of the Council of *Trent*.

First; "That the Images of Christ
" of the Virgin *Mary* Mother of God, *Session.*
" and of other Saints are to be kept *xxv. de*
" especially in Churches." *invocat.*
&c.

Secondly; "That due Honour and
" Veneration is to be given them."

As to the first Point; that *Holy Images* may be kept especially in Churches,

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

ches, this from the *written Word* is already fully proved.

As to the second Point; *That due Honour and Veneration is to be given them*, will be no hard task to demonstrate; since all Sides allow, that Persons may be affronted or honoured in their Images, and that the Honour or Affront which is done to Images redounds naturally upon the Prototypes or Originals which are represented by them. For the very Being of Images being relative, consequently the Honour or Respect which is shewn to them does not stop at the Images themselves, but is referred to the Parties they relate to, and is therefore by Catholicks called a *relative Honour*. For Instance, when we treat an Image of our Saviour Christ with due Respect, our Thoughts do not stop at the Image but go higher; for no sooner have we his Image before our Eyes, but we have the Thought or Imagination of him in our Mind, and to him the Honour is done. When

Acts. c. v.
v. 15.

the primitive Christians, as is related in the *Acts*, shewed a Respect and Veneration for the Shadow of *St. Peter* as he walked the Streets of *Jerusalem*, did the Honour and Respect they shewed, stop

stop at his Shadow, at his Image and Likeness, or was it referred to his Person? And when we shew the like Respect and Veneration to his Picture, is this any more Idolatry in us than it was in them? Let Protestants consider well, whether this very thing, which they so loudly condemn, is not daily done by themselves without Reflection: meer natural Reason teaching them, to honour the Prototypes or Originals in their Images. For, when they erect Statues to the Memory of their Kings and great Men, who have done Services to their Country, and procure the Pictures of their Ancestors to be made and kept with Honour and Respect, I suppose they do not pretend, that the honour is done to those inanimate Figures, but to the Parties who are thereby represented; so that their true meaning is to honour those Persons in their Images. Now if natural Reason has taught all Men, even Protestants, to honour great and illustrious Persons in their Images, why we may not shew this mark of Honour and Respect to Christ and his Saints, why we may not honour Christ in his Image as well as they do their earthly Kings, let them give a good Reason if they can.

E

In

In the mean time let them know, that no *divine Honour* is by us given either to Images or to any Creature, but to God alone. Let them know this from the exprefs Decree of our seventh general Council held, *Anno Domino* 787, and long ago received by both *Greek* and *Latin* Church, where we are taught:

Tom. 7. “ That to the Figure of the holy Cross,
Con. Lab. “ as also to other Images of Christ, and
Action. 7. “ of our Lady his Mother, of Angels and
Col. 555. “ Saints, may be given an honourary
 “ Respect and Veneration, (τιμητικῶν
 “ προσκύνησιν) but by no means
 “ that supreme Worship or true *Latria*
 “ (λατρείαν) which becomes only the
 “ Divine Nature.”

P O I N T XIII.

MANY Protestants hold, That it is absolutely unlawful to make and keep in our Churches Images or Pictures of God, because God is of a Spiritual and Invisible Nature, which no Man has seen in any Form.

Isaias c.
vi. v. 1.

Contrary to their Bible. 1. *In the Year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord sitting upon a Throne, high and lifted up*

up, and his train filled the Temple.....

For mine Eyes have seen the King the v. 5.
Lord of Hosts.

2. I beheld till the Thrones were cast ^{Dan. c.}
down, and the Antient of Days did sit, ^{vii. v. 9.}
whose Garment was white as Snow, and
the Hair of his Head like the pure Wool:
his Throne was like the fiery Flame, and
his Wheels as burning Fire.

3. I saw the Lord sitting on his ^{1 Kings c.}
Throne, and all the Host of Heaven ^{xxii. v.}
standing by him, on his right Hand and ^{19.}
on his left.

If God appeared in a Vision to the
Prophets in this Form, then he may be
pictured in the same Form: For why
the Histories of Holy Scripture may
not be pictured, no good Reason, sa-
rely, can be given. Especially, since
Catholicks do not pretend, that such
Paintings represent God in his true Na-
ture (which we know is purely spiri-
tual, invisible, incomprehensible, not to
be expressed in Lines and Colours) but
only the Visions in which he has ap-
peared.



P O I N T XIV.

PROTESTANTS hold, That there is no Purgatory or third Place, no middle State of suffering Souls in the other World; and that it is a vain and superstitious Custom to pray for the Dead.

Contrary to the written Word of God.

*Matth. c. i. And whosoever shall speak a Word
xii. v. 32. against the Son of Man, it shall be re-
mitted unto him; but he that shall speak
against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be
forgiven him, neither in this World,
neither in the World to come.*

These Words of our Saviour leave no room to doubt, but some Sins are remitted in the other World: But there are no Sins in Heaven, and none can be remitted in Hell: Then there must be a third Place, or middle State of Souls in the other World, which is neither Hell nor Heaven.

*2. According to the grace of God which
is given unto me, as a wise Master-
Builder I have laid the Foundation, and
another buildeth thereon, but let every
Man take heed how he buildeth there-
upon. For other Foundation can no Man
lay,*

*1 Cor. c.
iii. v. 10,
11.*

lay, than that is laid, which is *Jesus Christ*. Now if any Man build upon this Foundation, Gold, Silver, precious Stones, Wood, Hay, Stubble: Every Man's work shall be made manifest. For the Day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by Fire; and the Fire shall try every Man's work, of what sort it is. If any Man's work abide, which he has built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any Man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss: But he himself shall be saved; yet so, as by Fire.

Whether by the *Wood, Hay, and Stubble* here mentioned, is meant curious and unprofitable Doctrine, rather Philosophical than Apostolical, which some Preachers of the Gospel, like the *Corinthian* Doctors build upon the Foundation of the true Faith; or whether by the *Wood, Hay and Stubble*, are meant other lesser Sins and Imperfections, which the better sort of Christians, who hold the Foundation of the true Faith, are Subject to, certain it is, that by the *Wood, Hay and Stubble*, are signified some Sins or other of Christians, which do not merit eternal Damnation, because the Apostle assures us, that the Persons guilty of them will be saved; for which Sins nevertheless they will

be punished in the other World; because the same Apostle declares they shall pass *through Fire*: And whether this Fire be understood of a material elementay Fire, or a metaphorical one, that is, the *Affliction of the Mind*, great Sufferers certainly must these Souls be whilst they are passing through that Fire, wherein *their work will be burnt*, tho' at length their Persons will be saved, not without pain and difficulty, like a Man who to save his Life when his House is in Flames about him, is forced to pass through the Fire to make his escape. Some lesser Sins, then, according to the Apostle's Doctrine, Christians die guilty of not deserving eternal Damnation, which nevertheless are punished in the other World *with Fire*, whatever that Fire be; which is the genuine Doctrine of Purgatory maintained by Roman Catholicks.

1 Pet. c.

iii. v. 17,
18.

3. For Christ who hath once suffered for Sins, the just for the unjust (that he might bring us to God, being put to Death in the Flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went, and preached to the Spirits that were in Prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the Days of Noah, while the Ark was a preparing,

From

From this Text it appears, that at the time of our Saviour's Death there were some Souls in a state of Suffering (*in Prison*) in the other World on account of lesser Sins not deserving of Damnation, for certainly our Saviour would not have gone and *preached to them*, had they not been capable of Salvation. These Souls therefore were not in Heaven, where all preaching is needless, nor in Hell where all preaching is unprofitable; but *in the middle State of suffering Souls* they were: Which is the *Purgatory* maintained by Roman Catholicks.

4. *Who will render to every Man according to his Deeds.* Rom. c. ii. v. 6.

And then he will reward every Man according to his Works. Matth. c. xvi. v. 27. Apoc. c.

That God will render to every one according to their Works, with strict Justice in the other World, is plain in Scripture; even for every *idle Word* Matth. c. xii. v. 36. Man shall be accountable. Again we know from Scripture, that no one lives without Sin; *for there is no Man that sinneth not*, and in many things we offend all. But if no one lives without Sin, it is not to be doubted that great numbers even of the better sort of Christians die before they have sufficiently

1 Kings. c. viii. v. 46. James. c. iii. v. 2.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

washed away *all* their Sins *in the Blood of the Lamb*. For who of a thousand can say at the time of their Death, that they have by Penance *entirely* cancell'd every Sin they had committed of Thought, Word, or Deed, from the time they came to the use of Reason to the end of their Lives? Now, either Protestants maintain with the antient Stoick Philosophers, that all Sins are equal, at least, all Mortal, and if so whoever dies in any Sin before they have repented are for ever lost, (which Doctrine none but a Madman will maintain :) or they allow, that there are lesser Sins and Imperfections in Men, which we call venial Sins, and which are incident even to the Just, that do not merit eternal Torments: But, if there are many who before they have repented die guilty of lesser Sins which do not merit eternal Torments, either they are immediately, after Death, translated into the Joys of Heaven without undergoing the just Punishment of their Offences either in this World or the next, and then how is it true; *that God renders to every one according to their Works?* Or they are first punished in the other World in Proportion as their Sins deserve, and in the end are translated to Heaven;

Heaven; which in other words is what we mean by a Purgatory.

5. *But the most valiant Judas exhort- 2 Mach. c. xii. v. 42.*
 orted the People to preserve themselves from Sin, seeing before their Eyes what had happened for the Sins of those who were fallen in Battle. And making a Collection he sent twelve thousand drachma's of Silver to Jerusalem, for Sacrifice to be offered for the Sins of the Dead, thinking well and religiously of the Resurrection..... It is therefore a holy and wholsom Cogitation to pray for the Dead, that they may be loosed from their Sins.

Whether Protestants allow the History of the *Mackabees* a place in their Canon of Scripture or not, it may, I hope, be of sufficient Authority to inform them, that Prayers and Sacrifices for the Dead was formerly a solemn Rite of the *Jewish* Church, at a time when it was the true Church and taught the true Worship of God. Now if the Belief of a third Place or Purgatory was a Point of true Faith then, revealed from God, and delivered to the *Jews* by Tradition from the Saints, it is also a Point of true Faith now.

P O I N T X V.

Rubrick at
the end of
the com-
mon Ser-
vice in the
Book of
Common
Prayer.

PROTESTANTS hold, That in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, or the Lord's Supper, the Elements of the Bread and Wine after Consecration remain still in their very natural Substances; and that the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, are not truly, really, and substantially present in that Sacrament.

Contrary to all the four Gospels.

Matth. c.
xxvi. v.
26.

1. *And as they were eating, Jesus took Bread and blessed it and brake it, and gave it to the Disciples and said: Take, eat, this is my Body. And he took the Cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying: drink ye all of it; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the Remission of Sins.*

Mark c.
xiv. v. 22.

2. *And as they did eat, Jesus took Bread and blessed it and brake it, and gave it to them and said, take, eat, this is my Body. And he took the Cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, this is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many.*

3. *And*

3. *And he took Bread and gave thanks and brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, this is my Body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the Cup after Supper, saying, this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you.* Luke c. xxii. v. 19.

Note in the Greek it is still plainer; which Cup is shed for you.

4. *For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same Night in which he was betrayed took Bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said: Take, eat; this is my Body which is broken for you: Do this in remembrance of me. And after the same manner also, he took the Cup when he had supped, saying, this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood. This do ye, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me.* 1 Cor. c. xi. v. 23.

Now the pretension of Protestants is, that these most plain Words of Christ, *This is my Body; This is my Blood*, are not to be taken in the literal Sense, but to be expounded in a figurative Sense: viz. That it is his Body and Blood in Figure only: Or a Sacrament of his Body and Blood to be taken in remembrance of his Death. In like manner as the eating of the Paschal Lamb, is said in Scripture to Exod. c. xii. v. 11.
be

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

be *the Lord's Passover* : Yet the Paschal Lamb was not *the Lord's Passover itself*, but only a Sacrament of the Old Law, instituted in remembrance of the Passover.

To this *Roman* Catholicks reply : That altho' some Phrases in Scripture are to be expounded in a figurative Sense, yet the general Rule allowed even by Protestants is, that the literal Sense of God's Word is not to be forsaken, and a figurative Sense introduced without evident Reasons, and an absolute necessity for so doing. These Reasons are now to be examined. *First*, what Reasons are produced by Protestants for wresting so many plain Sentences of Scripture to a Figure. *Secondly*, what Reasons *Roman* Catholicks give for expounding these Words of our Saviour, in the obvious literal Sense.

When we challenge a Protestant to assign his *evident Reasons*, why he expounds the plain Words of our Saviour above cited in a figurative Sense, his answer and only answer is, that several other Expressions of holy Scripture, as for instance, *I am the Door. I am the true Vine. The Rock was Christ*, are figuratively to be understood, therefore why

John c.
x. v. 7.
Jo. c. xv.
v. 1.
1 Cor. c.
x. v. 4.

why not also these Words, *This is my Body; This is my Blood?*

But this is so far from giving evident Reasons for their figurative Interpretation, that in Truth it is giving us no Reason at all. For, because some Expressions of holy Scripture are to be figuratively expounded, is it a consequence that any other part of holy Writ may be expounded so too to make it square with our Opinions? At this rate, an *Arian* Heretick might pretend, that when our Saviour in holy Scripture is called *God*, and *the Son of God*, it is only figuratively, because he is in other places figuratively called *a Door* or *a Vine*. In like manner may some other Heretick pretend, that Christ's *Death*, *Burial*, *Resurrection* and *Ascension*, are to be understood not literally but figuratively, because *his sitting at the right Hand of God* is a figurative saying.

As to those Expressions, *I am the Door*. *I am the true Vine*. *The Rock is Christ*, and the like, the evident Absurdity of the literal Sense, determines us to understand them in a figurative one, for who will pretend that our Saviour was a *Door*, or a *Vine-Tree*, or that a *Rock* of Stone was Christ
in

in a literal Sense? Then, as to the Paschal Lamb being called the *Lord's Passover*, we know this to be figurative, because the Scripture so expounds it in the same Chapter saying, that it is *the Sacrifice of the Lord's Passover*.

Exod. c.
xii. v. 27.

But in no part of Scripture do we find these Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, expounded in a figurative Sense: Not one of the sacred Writers has warned us not to understand them literally of the true and real Body and Blood of our Saviour. Neither do we find any *figure of Speech* like this in Scripture, or in any other Writing whatsoever: Nor, in a word, is there any evident Absurdity in the literal Sense which may oblige us to have recourse to a figurative Meaning, since there is nothing in *Transubstantiation* but what is clearly within the Sphere of infinite Power; nay, it is an easier thing to comprehend, that God can change one Substance into another Substance, than make all Substances out of nothing. The Protestant then remains destitute of all Proof for his figurative Sense, and he must own his Interpretation of the Text in question is purely arbitrary, which if once allowed, the literal Sense of all other parts of Scripture

Scripture too may by the same rule be, by Hereticks and Freethinkers, allegorized and explained all away in Figures.

If, on the other hand, Protestants challenge *Roman* Catholicks to give Reasons, why they take these Words of our Saviour in the obvious literal Sense, it is much the same thing as to ask a Person who is travelling to *London* on the *publick High-Road*, why he goes that way? No one will put the Question to him, why he goes that way, because it is plain he goes *the right Way*; but as to those who take *by Ways*, and have left the *High-Road* to follow *private Paths*, to them it belongs to look to themselves, and consider well whither such ways lead them. However, to give satisfaction to every one who asks us the Reason of our Belief, let Protestants know, that we expound these Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, not without many substantial Reasons in the obvious literal Sense.

First Reason, Because our Saviour speaks of that Body which was given for our Redemption; *This is my Body which is given for you*: He speaks also of that Blood which was shed for Remission of our Sins; *This is my Blood*
of

The PROTESTANT'S *Tryal*

of the New Testament, which is shed for many for Remission of Sins. Either then Protestants will be forced to maintain with *Roman* Catholicks, that the true and real Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are really present in this Sacrament, or that it was not his true and real Body that was given for our Redemption; not his true and real Blood that was shed for our Sins, but in *Figure* only.

Jo. c. vi.

*v. 51, 52,
&c.*

Second Reason, Because our Saviour himself in the sixth Chapter of *St. John* has so fully explained the matter, as to leave no room to doubt, that his Body and Blood are truly and really present in this Sacrament. *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven, if any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever. And the Bread which I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the life of the World. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, how can this Man give us his Flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them: Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you. Who so eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last Day. For my Flesh is*
Meat

Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that Bread that came down from Heaven: Not as your Forefathers did eat Manna and are dead: He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever. These things said he in the Synagogue, as he taught at Capernaum. Many therefore of his Disciples when they heard this, said: This is an hard Saying, who can hear it? From that time many of his Disciples went back and walked no more with him.

Here our Saviour declares the true Meaning of his Doctrine of the Eucharist. If you ask, what is that Bread which we receive in this Sacrament? He himself answers, that it is *his own Flesh, his Flesh indeed, and his Blood indeed* which is eaten and drank in the Eucharist. And here all Protestants are desired to remark, that our Saviour spoke this with an express design to explain this Mystery of our Faith, being urged to interpret his Doctrine by the *Jews*, who were highly scandalized at his saying, *the Bread which I will give is*

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

is my own Flesh; and exclaimed against it, as a thing impossible to be done; *how can this Man, say they, give us his Flesh to eat?* So that, on the one hand, we cannot doubt but our Saviour here intended to explain this Mystery of our Faith, and to declare clearly what we are to believe of it; and on the other hand we find, that when he comes to explain it, instead of correcting his Doctrine of the *Real Presence* by a figurative Sense, he repeats the same Doctrine again and again in stronger Words than before, nor does he once so much as hint, that it is figuratively to be understood. Now I appeal to all sincere Protestants, if it be not utterly incredible and impossible, that the holy Scriptures in every Place where this Sacrament is spoken of, should teach in plain Words, that it is the Body and Blood of Christ; (supposing, as Protestants do, that it is not really his Body and Blood;) and never once unfold the Truth of this Mystery, by giving us to understand in Words as plain, that it is his Body and Blood in Figure only, supposing that were the true Meaning of his Words.

Third Reason, Because St. Paul too explains this Mystery of our Faith altogether

together in favour of those who take our Saviour's Words in the literal Sense. For if the Question be put, what the Eucharist is? Whether the true and real Body and Blood of Christ or not? The Apostle resolves it for Catholicks, not for the opinion of Protestants. *The 1 Cor. c. Cup of Blessing, says he, which we Bless, x. v. 16. is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? And the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?*

Again, if we put the Question, Whether the Body and Blood of Christ are present by Faith only to the worthy Receiver? The Apostle gives it clearly against the Protestants opinion: *Wherefore, says he, whosoever shall eat of this Bread, or drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* Chap. xi. v. 27.

For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body. Now, according to this Doctrine of the Apostle, it is exceeding plain that the Body and Blood of our Lord are as truly and really received by the unworthy as by the worthy Communicant, and consequently truly and really present to all who receive, and not by Faith v. 29.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

Faith only to the worthy Receiver : For if the unworthy do not receive the true Body and Blood of Christ in this Sacrament, how can they be said to be guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ? or, not to discern the Lord's Body?

Fourth Reason, When God in holy Scripture speaks with an exprefs Design to make known to us some new Institution or Command upon which our Salvation depends; or to discover some high Mystery of Faith, which was entirely new to the World, which was necessary for the World to know, and which could only be known from his Words; then, if ever, we have good Reason to believe the Word of God speaks plainly, and ought to be taken in the obvious natural Sense of the Words: Now here, our Saviour spoke those Words, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, at the Institution of a great Sacrament upon which our Salvation depends, with an exprefs Design to reveal a high Mystery of Faith, which was entirely new to the World, which was necessary for the World to know, and which could be known to his Disciples only from his Words: We conclude then, that his Words upon such an occasion ought in all Reason to be understood

understood in the plain obvious literal Sense. Add to these Reasons, that the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church, in all Ages has ever expounded these Words of our Saviour in the literal Sense, and ever condemned those for Hereticks, who have at any time attempted to wrest them to a Figure.

The only reply Protestants can make to this weight of Proofs for the Real Presence and Transubstantion, is from the Words of our Saviour, *Do this in remembrance of me.* From whence they pretend to conclude, that the Eucharist is only a Sacrament instituted in Bread and Wine to be taken in *remembrance* of his Death, and that his Body and Blood are not really and substantially present in it.

To whom we Answer; that the Words, *Do this in remembrance of me,* do not furnish the least shadow of a Proof against the *Real Presence*, because the Eucharist, as it is believed by Catholicks, is a much more lively *remembrance* of Christ, than as it is held by Protestants. For Catholicks who hold *Transubstantiation* and *the Real Presence*, and firmly believe, that as often as they partake of this Sacrament, they really receive the same Body of Christ that was crucified, the
same

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

same Blood of Christ that was shed for their Redemption, do certainly, with much more lively Sentiments of Devotion, renew in themselves the remembrance of our Saviour's Death, and Passion, than Protestants can do, who believe, that they only receive Bread and Wine, *in their natural Substances*, in remembrance of him. It is therefore, very bad and false reasoning to conclude, that the Body and Blood of Christ are not really present in the Eucharist, from the Words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, when these Words are more clearly consistent with the Catholicks Belief of *the Real Presence*, than with the contrary Opinion of Protestants.

Is it not enough then to stagger all who are serious among them, when they reflect that the literal obvious plain Sense of the Word of God is in all the four Gospels, and in St. Paul full and clear against them in this important Controversy, and more full and clear for the Catholicks Belief of *the Real Presence*, then any Text that can be produced, by Protestants, for the Belief even of the Trinity or Incarnation? Especially if they reflect again, that all Antiquity too is full against them; that the antient Fathers, *Greek and Latin,*

Latin, all Christian Churches both in the East and West, have ever believed the Real Presence, and Transubstantiation with Catholicks (as Catholick Writers have demonstrated beyond Reply) and that Protestants have none to uphold them in their Unbelief, but the unbelieving *Jews* in the Synagogue of *Caphernaum*, who protested against the Doctrine of the Real Presence, the moment the Mouth of Eternal Truth had taught it, and disputed with him, as Protestants do now with his Church, the Possibility of it, saying, *how can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?* Let not Protestants at least pretend they have the written Word of their Side in this great Controversy, but let them fairly own the Truth, that as for Texts from the Word of God, they can produce none for their Opinion; and that their true and only Reason for not holding *Transubstantiation* and the Real Presence, is their natural Difficulty in believing a hard and high Mystery of Faith above their Comprehension (which has ever been the Case of those that have not Faith.) But if the Incomprehensibility of this Mystery be a sufficient Reason for them to reject it, they may, for the same Reason with Freethinkers and Infidels, deny

See *Per-*
ron. and
Mr. Ar-
naud, Per-
petuité de
la Foy.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

deny the Myſtery of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eternity of the Pains of Hell, the Reſurrection of the Dead, and all the fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Religion.

P O I N T XVI.

PROTESTANTS hold, That Communion in one Kind is only half of the Sacrament, not ſufficient for Salvation: And that the Laity are bound by our Saviour's Inſtitution and Command to receive in both Kinds.

Jo. c. vi.
v. 50.

Contrary to the Goſpel. 1. *This is the Bread that cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may eat thereof and not die.*

v. 51.

2. *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven, if any Man eat of this Bread he ſhall live for ever.*

v. 57.

3. *So, he that eateth me, even he ſhall live by me.*

v. 58.

4. *He that eateth of this Bread ſhall live for ever.*

Four times is everlaſting Life here promiſed by the Mouth of our Saviour himſelf to him that receives in one Kind under the Form of Bread. For that which is eaten in this Sacrament is only

one

one Kind, because the other Kind, that is, the Cup is *drank* not *eaten*. Yet our Saviour declares, that by what the Faithful *eat* in this Sacrament, they receive Christ himself, and with him everlasting Life. Therefore Communion in one Kind is sufficient according to the Gospel of Christ.

5. *Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this Bread, AND drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* 1 Cor. c. xi. v. 27.

Here Protestants may remark one of the most notorious wilful Corruptions of the Text that ever was, in their *English* Translation of the Testament, where the Word *AND* is inserted instead of the Word *OR*. For in the *Greek* Testament in all their own Editions, and in all the antient Manuscripts from whence they pretend to have made or corrected their *English* Translation, the Word *OR* is found in the Text, instead of the Word *AND*. So that they have made the Text false in the Translation, which they have left true in all the Originals, to the eternal Disgrace of the Translators. The true Text then is as follows.

Wherefore, who soever shall eat this Bread, OR drink this Cup of the Lord
F
unworthily

*The PROTESTANT'S Tryal
unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and
Blood of the Lord.*

It is no hard matter to guess why the *English* Translators corrupted this Text, and inserted the Word **AND** for the Word **OR** : For if they had left the Word **OR** standing in the Text thus, *whosoever shall eat this Bread, OR drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, &c.* the plain Meaning of it will be, that whosoever receives in either Kind unworthily is guilty both of the Body and Blood of our Lord. Now, if Communion, tho' in one Kind only, makes the unworthy Communicant guilty, both of the Body and Blood, then by a necessary Consequence, a worthy Communion, tho' but in one Kind, makes the worthy Communicant Partaker both of Body and Blood, and consequently, the whole Sacrament is received in either Kind : Which is so strong an Argument for Communion in one Kind, that to conceal it from the Eyes of Protestants, the Translators of their Bible and Testament thought well to corrupt the Text, and put in the Word **AND** instead of the Word **OR**, that so the Word of God may seem to speak in favour of the Reformation.

Again

Again: In this Text, *like Detriment* is threatened to him who receives unworthily in one Kind as in both: *Who-soever shall eat this Bread, or drink the Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. Like Benefit* is also promised to him that worthily receives in one Kind as in both: *He that eateth this Bread shall live for ever*: That is, he that receives worthily in one Kind under the Form of Bread, *shall live for ever*. Now, if the holy Scripture threatens *like Detriment* to him that receives unworthily in one Kind as in both; and promises *like Benefit* to him that worthily receives in one Kind as in both, do not Catholicks rightly judge from thence, that under each Kind the true and entire Sacrament is received, and that Communion in one Kind is sufficient for Salvation?

The true Cause of that inveterate childish Prejudice which Protestants from their Infancy have imbibed from their Parents and Nurses against Communion in one Kind, is in reality their want of a true Faith in the Sacrament itself. For had they but a true Faith of it, that the Body and Blood of Christ is there really present, and not, only the Body of Christ present under

the Form of Bread, and the Blood only of Christ under the Form of Wine, but that both Body and Blood, Christ himself entire true God and Man is really present and received the same in one Kind as in both; had they, I say this true Belief, they might then without Difficulty understand that the Sacrament is whole and entire in one Kind. For since the Grace of this Sacrament is wholly derived, not from the outward Forms and Appearances of the Elements, but from the Real Presence of our Saviour Christ, and since our Saviour Christ is really present and received entire, the same in one Kind as in both, it must be evident to all who have this true Belief of the Eucharist, that the *whole Sacrament* with all the Grace that is essential to it, is received by Communion in one Kind; and the only Reason of the Protestants Persuasion that Communion in one Kind is but half of the Sacrament, is because they are Infidels in point of the Sacrament itself, and neither believe that Christ is received in one Kind, nor in both. O how wonderful in this point is the Religion of Protestants! That they who by their Ministers have so long been taught to exclaim against the Priests of the Church

Church of *Rome*, for defrauding the Laity of the Cup, or as they usually term it, of *the Sacrament of Christ's Blood*, cannot all this while reflect, that themselves are by their Ministers defrauded both of Body and Blood! For it is very well known to us, and believed by themselves, that in *their* Sacrament they have nothing but Bread and Wine: And since their Ministers teach, that the Body of Christ is no where but in Heaven, and as far distant from their Sacrament, as Heaven is from the Earth, it is evident, that by this Doctrine they have destroyed, as far as in them lies, the whole Substance and Sanctity of this Sacrament, and give their People meer Signs, Types, Figures, and meer Shadows, instead of it; *poor Elements* of Bread and Wine, *more empty, poor, and weak Elements*, than those that were formerly in use under the Old Testament.

Against Communion in one Kind, Protestants alledge the Institution of Christ; For this Sacrament being by him instituted under the Forms both of Bread and Wine, this, they think, sufficiently implies a Command for all, to receive it in both Kinds.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

To this we Answer: That the Institution of this Sacrament in both Kinds, is indeed a sufficient Instruction to the Priests of the Church, how they are to *Consecrate* this Sacrament, viz. in both Kinds; but no Precept was given by our Saviour at the Institution of it, for all the Laity to *partake* in both Kinds, which is the Point to be proved by Protestants.

Matth. c.
xxvi. v.
27.

They reply, That the Words of our Saviour, *Drink ye all of this*, contain a positive Command for all to drink of the Cup.

Matth. c.
xxvi. v.
20.
Mark c.
xiv. v. 17.
Luke c.
xxii. v.
14.

We answer, That the twelve Apostles were *all* that were present with our Saviour at the last Supper, as *St. Matthew, Mark, and Luke* witness; the most therefore that can be proved from those Words of our Saviour, *Drink ye all of this*, is, that he gave a Command to the twelve Apostles and to Priests to partake in both Kinds, as often as they Consecrate this Sacrament, which is constantly done in the Catholick Church. But no such Command is here given to the Laity; and Protestants may as well conclude, that the Laity are commanded to *preach the Gospel*; to *forgive Sins*; and to *Consecrate* this Sacrament; because we find such Commissions

Matth. c.
xxviii. v.
19.
Jo. c. xx.
v. 22.
Luke c.
xxii. v. 20.

missions in holy Scripture were given to the Apostles.

They reply once more from the sixth of *St. John. Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood ye have no life in you.* Here, they think, is a positive Command to all both Clergy and Laity, to the whole Church in general, to receive in both Kinds.

Now in Answer to this we say, that if here is a Precept of Communion delivered to the whole Church in general, no wonder if Communion in both Kinds be mentioned; because in the whole Church the Priests are included as the principal Part, whose Office it is to Consecrate, and receive in both Kinds, as often as they Consecrate. But much more probable it is, that our Saviour, in the Place above cited, had no Intention to deliver any Precept at all to the *Caphernaites*, concerning the manner of receiving this Sacrament, whether in one Kind, or in Both; but only concerning the Substance of it. For as to Communion in both Kinds, that was not the Dispute between him and them; but concerning the Substance of the Sacrament, the Real Presence of his Body and Blood, was their Strife. They strove among themselves, saying, how can this

Man give us his Flesh to eat? To whom he immediately replied: *Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood ye have no life in you.* A Command indeed here is to the *Caphernaïtes*, and, if you will, to the whole Church, Clergy and Laity to receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and to believe *the Real Presence too* of his Body and Blood, which, being the very Point by the *Caphernaïtes* denied, is consequently the Point by our Saviour affirmed; not Communion in both Kinds, which only regarding the *manner* of receiving this Sacrament, and not being the Point disputed, we have no Reason to believe that was the thing our Saviour here intended to determine. Now as to the Precept here given to the *Caphernaïtes*, to Communicate of the Body and Blood of Christ, and to believe the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in this Sacrament, by whom is this Precept fulfilled? By Catholicks, who believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ, Christ himself God and Man, is really present, and received entire under *each Kind*; or by Protestants, who by the Principles of their Religion are taught to believe, that the Body and Blood of

of

of Christ are neither really present nor received either in *one Kind* or *Both*?

But why does Scripture in so many Places mention both the Bread and the Cup together, is not this a good Argument that both are to be received?

“ A most weak and insufficient Argument. As if *mentioning* a thing were
 “ *commanding* it. And how easily might
 “ this Logick of Protestants be turned
 “ against themselves: For both several
 “ other Places of Scripture mention
 “ the Bread alone, and that very Chapter of St. Paul (1 Cor. xi.) which
 “ mentions both Kinds, so often, mentions also in Verse the twenty seventh,
 “ *either* the Bread *or* the Cup: A plain
 “ Argument, according to the Protestants way of arguing, *that the Bread*
 “ *alone, or either the Bread or the Cup,*
 “ *is to be received.* The Truth is, that

“ from the places of Scripture which
 “ *mention both Kinds*, it is neither a
 “ Consequence that there is a *Command*
 “ for every one to receive *both*: Nor
 “ is it a Consequence from the Places
 “ of Scripture which *mention but one*,
 “ that there is a *Command* of receiving
 “ *but one*. But whereas the Scripture
 “ mentions sometimes *both*, and sometimes *one*, the only natural Consequence

Jo. c. vi.
 53, 54,
 55, 56.
 1 Cor. c.
 x. v. 16.
 Chap. xi.
 v. 19.
 See Catholic
 Answer to
 Mr. Barret's Sermon § 15.
 Page 38.
 Acts. c. ii.
 v. 42.
 Acts c.
 xx. v. 7.
 Luke c.
 xxiv. v.
 30.
 Jo. c. vi.
 51, 58.

“ quence is, that this Sacrament may
 “ be taken sometimes in *one* Kind,
 “ sometimes in *both*, as it seems pro-
 “ per and expedient to the Church,
 “ which is certainly left at Liberty to
 “ order and dispose such Matters (as
 “ to the *manner* of receiving or ad-
 “ ministring Sacraments) whensoever
 “ the Scripture or God himself does
 “ not otherwise determine.” And

hence we may gather, that the holy Eucharist, was received sometimes in one Kind and sometimes in both, in the times of the Apostles; which is the true Reason why the Scripture sometimes mentions *only one Kind*, sometimes *both* in speaking of this Sacrament; it being usual for Writers to mention things according to what the Custom is when they write. That sometimes, even in the Age of the Apostles, this Sacrament was received in one Kind may also be gathered from these

1 Cor. c.
xi. v. 27.

Words of St. Paul. *Whosoever shall eat of this Bread, or drink the Cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* Which proves, that the Faithful then might receive *either* the Bread *or* the Cup. The same Truth may be gathered from the

Acts. c. ii.
v. 42.

Acts. And they continued stedfastly in the

*the Apostles Doctrine and Fellowship,
and in breaking of Bread and in Prayer.*

As also from Chap. xx. And upon the v. 7.
*first day of the week (Sunday) when the
Disciples came together to break Bread,
Paul preached unto them, and continued
his Speech until Midnight.* It is highly
probable that *this breaking of Bread* was
no other than the Eucharistical Bread;
otherwise why is it joined with *Preach-
ing and Prayer*, and said to be done in
the religious Assemblies of the primi-
tive Christians on a *Sunday*? From these
Texts then it is more than probable
that the Faithful, even when the Apo-
stles were living, did sometimes com-
municate in one Kind. And certain it
is, and a thing well known to all learned
Protestants, that in the second and
third Age of the Church the holy Eu-
charist was frequently given to the Sick
and others *in one Kind only.*

Protestants themselves, notwithstanding
their Exclamations against *Communi-
cation in one Kind*, are conscious that it is
the true and entire Sacrament, and by
no means contrary to the Institution
and Command of Christ. For there
are Decrees in the Reformed Churches
abroad, that the Holy Communion may
be administred *in one Kind* in Cases of
Necessity,

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

1 Ed. VI.

c. 1.

1 Eliz. c.

1.

Necessity, when any Person, thro' Sick-
ness or Antipathy to Wine is a'e uncapa-
ble of receiving both Kinds. And as
to the Church of *England*, by a Statute
of *Edward* the sixth, which was con-
firmed by another of *Queen Elizabeth*,
it is enacted, that the holy Communion
shall be commonly administred to the
People in both Kinds, with this excep-
tion, *unless Necessity do otherwise require*.
A very fair Confession, that Commu-
nion in one Kind *is an entire Sacra-
ment*, or else in every Case it would be
an entire Sacrilege; nor can it be said
by Protestants to be contrary to the
Institution and Command of Christ,
unless, it be said too, that the Prote-
stant Parliament of *England*, with *the
Supreme Governess of the Church of Eng-
land* the glorious *Queen Elizabeth* at
the Head of them, did by a solemn
Act dispense with the People of *England*,
to receive the Communion *in some Cases
in one Kind, contrary to the Institution
and Command of Christ*; which I really
believe every *English* Protestant will be
ashamed to own.



POINT

P O I N T XVII.

PROTESTANTS hold, That the Holy Eucharist was ordained by Christ to be partaken by us only as a Sacrament; nor can it be offered to God on the Altar as a propitiatory Sacrifice without Injury done to Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross.

Contrary to the Gospel. 1. *This is* *Matth. c.*
my Blood of the New Testament which *xxvi. v.*
is shed for many for the Remission of *27.*
Sins.

2. *This is my Blood of the New Tes-* *Mark. c.*
tament which is shed for many. *xiv. v. 23.*

3. *This is my Body which is given* *Luke. c.*
for you..... This Cup is the New Tes- *xxii. v.*
tament in my Blood which is shed for *19.*
you.

It is still plainer in the Greek * *Which* *v. 20.*
Cup is shed for you. Now, if that which
was then in the Cup was shed for us,

* Annotation, *Which Cup is shed for you.* In the Greek thus. τὸ το ποτερον ἢ ἡδιν διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μὲ τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον. Where those who understand Greek may Remark, that τὸ before ἐκχυνόμενον does not agree in case with αἵματι, but with ποτερον; so that the exact Translation is; *Which Cup is shed for you.*

it is a clear Consequence, *First*, That the true and Real Blood of our Saviour was in the *Cup*, because no other but his true and Real Blood was shed for us. And *Secondly*, That the holy Eucharist, or Body and Blood of Christ under the Forms of Bread and Wine, was by our Saviour offered as a *Propitiation for Sin*: And consequently the Eucharist is truly and properly an Offering or Sacrifice as well as a Sacrament. As the Paschal Lamb or Passover of the Old Law was both a Sacrament and Sacrifice.

Psal. cx. 4. The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchisedeck.

According to St. *Paul* to the *Hebrews*, this was spoke by our Saviour Christ, who, as the Apostle says, was made an *High-Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchisedeck, and not after the Order of Aaron*. Now *Melchisedeck's* Sacrifice, according to the Book of *Genesis*, as all the antient Fathers expound it, was an Offering of Bread and Wine. And *Melchisedeck King of Salem brought forth Bread and Wine; and he was the Priest of the most high God*. Therefore, it must either be granted; That our Saviour sacrificed at his last Supper under the forms of Bread and Wine, or he

*Heb. c.
vi. v. 20.
Chap. vii.
v. 11.*

*Gen. c.
xiv. v. 18.*

he never sacrificed at all after the *Order* and *Rite* of *Melchisedeck*; and then, how is he *a Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchisedeck*? Since the different Orders of Priests are chiefly distinguished by their Sacrifice, which is the principal Function of a Priest. But if our Saviour sacrificed at his last Supper, under the Forms of Bread and Wine, he also gave his Apostles a Command and Power to do the same thing, which he did, which Power still remains in the Church, and will remain in it to the End of the World. Then the Eucharist is for ever to be offered in the Church as a Propitiatory Sacrifice, by the Hands of those who are Priests in it, by whose Hands Christ himself principally offers it, and thus is *a Priest for ever, according to the Order of Melchisedeck*.

Heb. c. v.
v. 1.

5. *I have no Pleasure in you saith the Lord of Hosts, neither will I accept an Offering at your Hands. For from the rising of the Sun unto the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every Place incense shall be offered unto my Name, and a pure Offering.* Malachi c. i. v. 11, 12.

Here the Prophet clearly foretels, that the Priesthood and Sacrifices of the
Old

Θυσία
καθάραι
Septua-
gint.

Old Law were to cease after the coming of Christ, and that another Sacrifice or pure Offering was to succeed, and to be offered by the *Gentiles* converted, in all Places to the true God of Israel. Now, this pure Offering mentioned by *Malachi*, could not be the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, because that was only offered *one Time*, and in *one Place*; whereas this was to be offered in every Place. Neither can this pure Offering be understood of a spiritual Sacrifice of Praise, Thanksgiving, Prayer, Devotion: because this Kind of Sacrifice is common both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and has been ever offered to God, by all his true Adorers from the Beginning of the World; whereas the Prophet speaks of a pure Offering peculiar to the New Law, which was to succeed in the Room of the *Levitical* Sacrifices that were to cease: And to be offered by the *Gentiles* converted; which can be no other than the Eucharistical Sacrifice, daily offered to God in all Nations.

Against this Sacrifice of the Altar Protestants object the Words of St. Paul to the *Hebrews*. 1. *And they truly were many Priests, because they were not suffered to continue by Reason of Death; but this*

Heb. c.vii.
v. 23.

*this Man, because he continueth ever, bath v. 24.
an unchangeable Priesthood.*

Here, say they, the Apostle teaches that the Priest of the New Testament, is *only one*, our Saviour Christ.

2. *But this Man after he had offered Chap. x.
one Sacrifice for Sins, for ever sat down v. 12.
on the right Hand of God.*

Here again, say they, we learn that the Host or Sacrifice of the New Testament is also *but one*, to wit, that which was offered on the Cross.

3. *Nor yet that he should offer himself of- Chap. ix.
ten, as the High-Priest entereth every Year v. 25.
into the holy Place, with the Blood of others :
(For then must he have suffered from the
Foundation of the World) but now in the
end of the World, bath he appeared to put
away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself.*

4. *By the which will we are sancti- Chap. x.
fied, through the Offering of the Body v. 10.
of Jesus Christ once for all. . . . Now Chap. x.
where Remission of Sins is, there is no v. 18.
more offering for Sin.*

Here say they again, it is plain, that as there is but *one* Sacrifice of the New Law, so it was but *one time* offered, and is never more to be repeated. So that three Points are proved from this Doctrine of the Apostle. *First*, That there is but *one Priest* of the New Testament,

Testament, who is our Saviour Christ. Secondly, But *one Sacrifice*, which is that of Christ on the Cross. Thirdly, That the Offering of this Host or Sacrifice being *one Time* made, is never more to be repeated. Because this one Sacrifice being of so great a Price, as to take away all Sin, and to open the Gates of the Kingdom of Heaven, and consequently, God by this one Sacrifice being fully satisfied, and the repenting Sinner fully secured, there is no need this Sacrifice should be often repeated, nor is there now any other Offering to be made for Sin. And whosoever maintains, that another Sacrifice is necessary, does as good as declare the first insufficient. Therefore the Eucharistical Sacrifice, they think, cannot be defended without Injury to the Sacrifice of the Cross.

In Answer to this, we affirm, that Protestants have intirely mistaken the sense of the Apostle; for certain it is, he does not dispute in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, against the Eucharistical Sacrifice of the New Law, but concerning the Sacrifices of the Old Law, which his unbelieving Countrymen the *Jews* pretended, as modern *Jews* do now, were of themselves sufficient to remit Sin, and to sanctify the People without
Respect

Respect to any more perfect Sacrifice, which was to be offered in time to come: And that such being the Perfection of these Sacrifices, consequently they were unchangable and everlasting, as well as the Priesthood of *Aaron*, never to cease, or to be succeeded by a Priesthood or Sacrifices of any other Order, but always to continue: Against whom *St. Paul* proves the Insufficiency both of their Priesthood and Sacrifices, *First*, on the Part of the Priests, who being Sinners themselves, stood in need of another Mediator as much as the People for whom they offered Sacrifice. *Secondly*, on the Part of the Sacrifices or Hosts that were offered, which being only the Flesh and Blood of Calves and Goats, could not of themselves purify the Souls of Men from Sin, or pacify God's Anger against them. *Thirdly*, On the Part of the Offering or Act of Sacrificing, which being done by Men that were Sinners and imperfect, could not be effectual for taking away Sin, and this is the Reason why it was so often to be repeated. On the other side he argues, that such was the Perfection of our Saviour's Priesthood, in all those Points in which the other was defective, both as to the *Priest* himself, whose Per-
son

Heb. c.
vii. v. 27.
Chap. ix.
v. 7.

Chap. ix.
v. 9.
Chap. x.
v. 4.

Chap. vii.
v. 16.
Chap. x.
v. 1.
Chap. iii.
v. 11.

Chap. vii. son *was Innocent, undefiled separated*
 v. 26. *from Sinners*: And as to the *Host* which
 Chap. ix. *was not the Flesh and Blood of Beasts,*
 v. 12. *but his own Body and Blood.* And as
 Chap. x. to the Perfection of the Act of Sacri-
 v. 10. ficing by which he offered himself,
 that this *one Host, one time* Sacrificed,
 Chap. ix. by this *one Priest,* was sufficient to re-
 v. 25, 28. mit Sin, to sanctify the People, and
 Chap. x. to obtain eternal Redemption.
 v. 10, 12.

Now, to this Doctrine of the Apostle we readily subscribe, and freely own, that the Sacrifice of the Cross is a sufficient Reconciliation, an Atonement for Sin perfect in all Regards, the only Sacrifice by which we were redeemed, and by which Remission of Sins is purchased: And whosoever now should go about to maintain, that we have another Sacrifice, which is a Propitiation for Sin sufficiently of itself, *independently* of the Sacrifice of the Cross, could not defend one without injury to the other. But now, no such thing is defended by Catholicks; for we do not maintain the Eucharistical Sacrifice to be an Offering that remits Sin *independently* of the Sacrifice of the Cross, nor indeed to be a Sacrifice at all; but inasmuch as it has a respect to that of the Cross, inasmuch as it is
 instituted

instituted to represent our Saviour's Death on the Cross; the *same Host* too being offered here which was offered there; and the same High-Priest, our Saviour himself being the principal Offerer of this as well as of the other.

So great was the Perfection of the Sacrifice of the Cross, that it atoned not only for Sins committed since the Death of Christ, but as St. Paul clearly teaches, *for the Sins that were committed under the Old Testament*. Yet, notwithstanding the infinite Perfection of that Sacrifice, other Sacrifices there were under the Old Testament appointed by God himself; and these Sacrifices were true Sacrifices, Holy, and *Propitiatory* too for Sin, not indeed of themselves, but inasmuch as they respected that of the Cross, and were Types and Figures of it then to come. So now we maintain, that the Eucharistical Sacrifice is by our Saviour instituted to represent his dying on the Cross, now past, and to renew in us continually the Remembrance of it; a true Sacrifice indeed we hold it to be, a most holy Sacrifice, and *Propitiatory* too for Sin, tho' not *independently* of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but *with respect to it*, inasmuch as it is a lively Representation, and

Heb. c. ix.
v. 15.

and perpetual Commemoration of it. So that in reality the Eucharistical Sacrifice, is no Sacrifice at all, but inasmuch as it has a Relation to the great Sacrifice of the Cross. And in this very thing the infinite Perfection of that Sacrifice of the Cross consists, that whatsoever Sacrifices went before it, as well as the Eucharistical Sacrifice that follows it, have all a Respect to it, and are no otherwise *Propitiatory* for Sin, but for as much as they are the Means instituted by God, to apply to our Souls, the Remission of Sins, and other Benefits of Redemption, which that one *Redeeming* Sacrifice of the Cross purchased. By all which we do most clearly profess, that Remission of Sins and the whole benefit of our Redemption is to be ascribed to the Death of the Son of God; only we maintain, that besides the Death and Passion of Christ, God has made other Means necessary to apply the Benefits of his Death to us, and that the Eucharistical *Sacrifice*, as well as *Sacrament* is part of that Means.

Now, Protestants themselves must allow, that Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross is not decreed to save all Men, without other Means which God has made

made necessary to apply the Merits of his Death to us; for if the Sacrifice of the Cross were to save all Mankind, so that to use other Means were injurious to it, then we may lay aside the Sacraments, Faith, Repentance, and all the Means of our Justification, nay our Saviour's Intercession too at the right Hand of God, as superfluous and unnecessary things, and derogating from the Sufficiency of the Sacrifice of the Cross. But if they do admit of other Means necessary to Salvation, distinct from the Passion of Christ, they ought not to have taken away the Eucharistical Sacrifice, till they had first proved it is not part of those Means by our Saviour instituted.

P O I N T XVIII.

PROTESTANTS maintain, That neither the Apostles, nor those who succeed to their Office, Power and Jurisdiction, the Bishop and Priests of the Church, have any Power given them from our Saviour Christ to remit Sin; and that the Power of forgiving Sins, is so far the proper and peculiar Attribute

bute of God, that it cannot be by him given and communicated to Men.

Contrary to the exprefs Words of the Gospel. *But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath Power on Earth to forgive Sins, (then said he to the Sick of the Palsy) Arise, take up thy Bed and go unto thine House.*

Matth. c.
ix. v. 6.

The Intent of our Saviour in working this Miracle, was to convince the Jews, that altho' the Power of forgiving Sins belongs only to God, by Nature, yet that God does exercise this Power upon Earth, by the Ministry of Men, and that he himself as Man had this Power. Now this Truth of the Gospel, which we see here confirmed by a Miracle, and which even the unbelieving Jews confessed, when they saw the Miracle done to confirm it, *glorifying God for that he had given such a Power unto Men,* is nevertheless the very Point which Protestants still deny.

v. 8.

To this they reply, That this Text only proves, that our Saviour Christ who was both *God and Man* had Power to forgive Sins, which no Protestant ever denied, but they deny, that such a Power could be communicated to *pure Men* such as the Apostles and their Successors.

But

But this is no Answer to the Argument proposed, since it is plain in the Gospel, that our Saviour wrought this Miracle to prove, not that he in *quality of God, in quality of the Son of God*, had power to forgive Sins, but also in *quality of Man, of the Son of Man*: But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath Power on Earth to forgive Sins, &c. Therefore the Gospel relates that all the People were *astonished and glorified God*; and what were they astonished at? Not because God himself had such a Power of forgiving Sins, which they already knew and long before believed; but because he had given such a Power unto Men. First then, that Christ as Man had from God the Power of forgiving Sins, is not to be doubted: And Secondly, that he did give and impart the same Power to the Apostles is now to be proved from the Gospel.

2. Then said Jesus to them again: *John c. Peace be unto you: As my Father hath* xx. v. 21. *sent me, even so I send you. And when &c. he had said this, he Breathed on them, and said unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: And whosoever Sins ye retain they are retained.*

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

Is it not perverting the plain Sense of the Gospel to say, that our Saviour in these Words only gives the Apostles a Power of *declaring Peoples Sins to be remitted, not a Power of remitting them*? It is plain in the Gospel, that our Saviour gave to the Apostles the same Power to forgive Sins, which himself had received from his Father: Therefore he says to them: *As my Father sent me, so I send you*, with like Authority, like Power: With this difference notwithstanding, that God forgives Sins by his own Power, which by Nature belongs to him; the Apostles not by any Power they had of their own, but by a Power imparted to them, from Christ who received the same from God. So that whosoever was *Absolved* by an Apostle after our Saviour Christ had given the Apostles this Power, was as effectually absolved from his Sins, in case he was Penitent, as if our Saviour himself had said to him, *thy Sins are forgiven thee*; in like manner as he that was baptized by an Apostle, was as truly baptized and purified from Sin, as if Christ himself had baptized him; and the Lame, the Blind, and the Sick that were cured by the Apostles, by the Power they received

received from Christ, to cure Diseases, were as effectually Cured, as if they had been healed by the touch of his own Hands; because in reality when the Apostles wrought Miracles, it was God himself that principally wrought the Miracle by their Hands; and whenever the Apostles baptized, it was Christ himself that principally baptized; and whenever they absolved, and whenever the Priests of the Church now absolve, He it is, Christ himself that principally absolves.

3. *Verily, verily I say unto you, what* Matth. c. xviii. v. 18. *soever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven: And whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.*

Can any but Infidels, who hear this, doubt but Christ gave to the Apostles the Power of binding and absolving? And must not all confess that the Power of forgiving Sins, which the Apostles received from Christ, descends to their Successors, as much as the Power of preaching the Gospel, the Power of Baptizing and administering the other Sacraments, which altho' addressed to none personally but the Apostles, was however to continue with their Successors, the Pastors of the Church for ever? Let us conclude then, that the

Bishops and Priests of the Church have undoubtedly a Power from Christ, to absolve from their Sins, such as are truly contrite, confess, and seriously purpose to avoid Sin for the future; and by such Absolution, they are effectually released from the guilt of eternal Death.

P O I N T XIX.

PROTESTANTS hold, That we are to confess our Sins to none but God; and that it is needless to confess to Men; nor are we under any obligation to confess to the Priests.

Contrary to the expresse Words of their Bible. 1. *Confess your Sins one to another.* It cannot be denied that St. James the Apostle in these Words, does either command, or at least advise us to confess our Sins to Men; and whether this be understood of Sacramental Confession to Priests or not, it is a good Proof against Protestants, that we are not only to confess our Sins to God; nor is it needless to confess to Men.

Numb. c. 2. *Speak unto the Children of Israel*
 v. v. 6, & c. *when a Man or Woman shall commit*
 any

any Sin that Men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that Person be guilty; then they shall confess their Sin which they have done; and he shall recompense his trespass with the principal thereof, and add unto it the fifth Part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed. But if the Man have no Kinsman to recompense the trespass unto, let the trespass be recompensed unto the Lord, even to the Priest.

Now, if in the Case herein lastly mentioned, the Compensation was to be made to the Priest, then of consequence the Confession of the Sin was to be made to the Priest too, otherwise how must he know what Compensation to demand? The whole Text is a Proof that the People under the Old Testament were enjoined by the Law of *Moses* to confess their Sins to the Priests; for, *first*, the Priests were to order the Satisfaction that was to be made to the injured Party, by the Trespass done; And *secondly*, they were also to offer Sacrifices of *Propitiation*, such as the Law prescribed, which were different according to the Kind and Quality of the Offence; neither of which Offices could the Priests possibly perform, unless the People had confessed their Sins

to them. And altho' this was not sacramental Confession it was however a Figure of it; as was also the Law given to the Leprous to *shew themselves to the Priests, that they might judge between Leprosy and Leprosy, and discern between the clean and the unclean.*

Levit. c.
xiii. v. 15.

Matth. c.
iii. v. 5, 6.

3. Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the Region about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan confessing their Sins.

The Gospel does not say, these People confessed themselves only in general Terms to be Sinners, as Protestants do when they confess, *that they have done what they should not do; and have not done what they should do,* (which indeed is an eternal Truth;) but it is here said, that they confessed their Sins; which implies a particular Confession made to St. John Baptist of the Sins each one had committed. Which Confession tho' not Sacramental, was the Pattern and Preparation to it.

Acts. c.

xix. v. 18,
19.

4. And many that believed came and confessed, and shewed their Deeds. Many also of them that used curious Arts brought their Books together, and burned them before all Men; and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of Silver.

Here

Here we read that these new Converts at *Ephesus* came to St. Paul and confessed their Sins: *They came and confessed and shewed their Deeds*: Like true Penitents; first, believing, then repenting, then confessing, and lastly, making Satisfaction to God, by burning the Books which had been their Instructors in Wickedness.

Admitting all this to be true, replies the Protestant, it is not yet proved, that we are bound, *jure divino*, by the Command and Institution of Christ, to make a special Confession of all deadly Sins to the Priests of the Church.

I answer, that this is most clearly implied in these Words of our Saviour:

Verily, verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven. Matth. c. xviii. v. 18.

Whosoever Sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever Sins ye retain they are retained. Jo. c. xx. v. 23.

For according to a Maxim in Law; to whom Jurisdiction or Power is given, to them is also granted all those things without which the Power can never be put in Execution. And since it is not possible for the Priests of the Church to know, when they ought to absolve and when

to withhold their Absolution; whose Sins are to be remitted, and whose to be retained; what Satisfaction is to be made to God, what Compensation to the Parties injured, unless they are thoroughly apprised of the Sins of each one, and of the different Species and Qualities of them, which cannot be known to them otherwise than by the Confession of the Parties who have sinned; hence it is undeniable, that our Saviour giving to the Apostles a Power of *binding* and *absolving*; of *remitting* and *retaining* Sins; does thereby give to us a Command of confessing them to the Priest that is to absolve us; since without such Confession, the Power of *remitting* and *retaining* Sins could never have been put in Execution with any Degree of Judgment and Discretion: Which Truth being so very plain, nay, I may say, self-evident, there could be no Reason to expect from the Gospel any farther Precept of Confessing our Sins to the Priest.



POINT

P O I N T XX.

PROTESTANTS hold; That Penance entirely consists in a Sorrow for our Sins, and Amendment of Life; That no Punishment of the Sinner's own Person, no Penance enjoined by the Church, no Satisfaction by Prayers, Alms-deeds and Fasting, is necessary to pacify our offended God; nay, that all such Satisfaction is needless and superfluous, and moreover injurious to the Satisfaction Christ has already made for us.

Contrary to the exprefs Words of their Bible:

1. *Now therefore the Sword shall never depart from thy House, because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the Wife of Uriah the Hittite to be thy Wife.....*

And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said unto David. The Lord also hath put away thy Sin, thou shalt not die. Howbeit, because by this deed, thou hast given great Occasion to the Enemies of the Lord to Blaspheme, the Child also that is born unto thee shall surely die.

Here we find, that God afflicted David with many temporal Chastis-

ments, even after his Sin was forgiven; and it is well known from the Penitential Psalms of *David*, that tho' he knew by *Revelation* from the Prophet *Nathan*, that God had pardoned his Sin, that is, released him from the guilt of eternal Death, he nevertheless persisted in doing Penance for it, praying, weeping, and beseeching God for Mercy all the Days of his Life: To what Purpose? If, as Protestants affirm, Penance entirely consists in a change of Mind and amendment of Life, and that all other Satisfaction to be made to God by the Punishment of the Sinner's own Person is superfluous.

Joel c. ii. v. 12. 2. Therefore also now saith the Lord: turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning.

Job c. xlii. v. 6. 3. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in Dust and Ashes.

Matth. c. xi. v. 21. 4. Woe unto thee Chorazin, woe unto thee, Bethsaida, for if the mighty Works which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in Sack-cloth and Ashes.

Jonas c. iii. v. 5. 5. So the People of Niniveh believed God, and proclaimed a Fast, and put on Sack-cloth from the greatest of them, even to the least of them.

In

In these Texts of Holy Scripture, I think Penance is described in far other Characters, than in a bare change of Mind and Amendment of Life. In *Fasting, and Weeping, and Mourning*, as *Joel* has it. In *Dust and Ashes*, as *Job* has it. In *Sack-cloth and Ashes*, as our Saviour in the Gospel teaches. In *Sack-cloth and Fasting*, as *Jonas* testifies. Then there are other Works of Penance to be done to pacify God for Sin, besides a change of Heart, and amendment of Life, and such other Works of Penance, called in Scripture *worthy Fruits of Penance*; Works worthy

Matth. c.

iii. v. 8.

Acts c.

xxvi. v.

20.

P O I N T XXI.

PROTESTANTS hold, That the Use of Indulgences was not in the Days of the Apostles, nor has any foundation in Scripture.

Contrary to what we find written in *St. Paul*.

Sufficient to such a Man is this Punishment which is inflicted of many.

2 Cor. c.

ii. v. 6.

For

v. 10.

For if I forgave any, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave it In the Person of Christ.

1 Cor. c.

v. v. 3.

2 Cor. c.

v. v. 7.

The Apostle here speaks of a Man amongst the Christians of *Corinth*, who was guilty of Incest with his Mother-in-law. This Person the Apostles excommunicated, as appears by his first Epistle: And here he takes upon him to release the same Man, *In the Person of Christ*, that is, by Authority from Christ, from doing any farther Penance on Account of that Sin, the Apostle judging such a seasonable Indulgence to be most for his spiritual Good, *lest he should*, says he, *be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow*: Now, this is what in the Church of *Rome* is understood by an *Indulgence*. For as *St. Paul* here takes upon himself, by *Authority from Christ*, or as he expresses it, *In the Person of Christ*, first to enjoin a proper Penance to this Person for his Sin, and afterwards to remit Part of the Penance, which he had before enjoined, and to shorten the time of it, according as he judged it most for the spiritual Good of the Offender: In like manner the Pastors of the Church, who succeed in the Places of the Apostles, and inherit that Power which Christ gave to the Apostles when he

he said to them: *Whatsoever ye bind upon Earth shall be bound in Heaven,* *and whatsoever ye loose upon Earth shall be loosed in Heaven:* Matth. c. xviii. v. 18.

In particular the supreme Pastor the Bishop of Rome, who being the undoubted Successor of St. Peter, inherits from him *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, these Pastors of the Church, I say, have in all Ages since the Apostles, claimed and exercised a Power of granting the like Indulgences: That is, a Power of dealing with Sinners more or less Rigorously, of enjoining to them Penances of a longer or shorter date, as they judge most for their spiritual and eternal Good. For the end and intent as well of Penances as Indulgences, being the Salvation of the Party's Soul, (*That his Soul may be saved in the Day of the Lord Jesus*) which sometimes may be best procured by Rigour, sometimes by Mildness and Indulgence, hence the Church proceeds sometimes by one Method, sometimes by the other. In former Ages the Church exacted more rigorous Penances and granted fewer Indulgences: In latter Ages the Church has granted more Indulgences, and enjoined less rigorous Penances, lest the Devil might drive great Sinners, who
are

are commonly very weak, into Despair, in case they were to be dealt with too severely, and tempt them to forsake Christ and his Church, and all hopes of Salvation. This is a true and fair Account of the Doctrine, of Indulgences defended by the Church of Rome, which has moreover declared in the Council of Trent, that these Indulgences are *highly beneficial to Christian People*.

*Decretum
de Indul.
Sess. 25.*

To this Protestants reply, That such Indulgences, as they conceive, are rather *Prejudicial* to Christian People than *Beneficial*; For, say they, will not People be apt to take greater Liberties in transgressing, when they find they can be so easily acquitted, *First*, of the eternal Punishment, by *Absolution*, and *Secondly*, of the temporal Punishment by a *Plenary Indulgence*?

Answer, By no Means: For all the Members of the Church of Rome are constantly taught from their Childhood, that no Benefit can possibly be reaped from Indulgences, without a true and cordial Repentance. This may be seen by the Bulls of Indulgence, which come from Rome, wherein you will ever find, either this or some other Clause equivalent to it. *Verè contritis & confessis; verè pœnitentibus & confessis*: That is, that

that the Indulgence is only granted to *true Penitents*, to such as are *truly contrite and confess their Sins*. This Doctrine therefore being current with all Catholicks, that there is no hope of receiving the favour of an Indulgence, without a cordial Repentance, and a sincere resolution of leading a new Life, consequently, Indulgences so taught, instead of being an Encouragement to Sin, cannot but be a great Discouragement from it, and a great attractive to Repentance; and we find this verified every Day by experience in the Church of *Rome*, where Sinners, upon occasion of these Indulgences, are very frequently converted to God from a sinful Life, make general Confessions, and become new Men. I believe I may venture to affirm, that the *Indulgent Doctrine of the Reformation* which has acquitted all People of the Obligation of Confessing their Sins, and of making any Kind of Satisfaction to God for them, *by the Punishment of their own Persons*, under Pretence that Christ has fully satisfied for all, and therefore all Works of Penance done by us are superfluous. I say, *these Plenary Indulgences* which the Reformation grants to all Sinners of the whole Earth, have not yet produced

duced the like good Fruits : and we are content the World should judge, whether their *Indulgences* or ours are more *beneficial to Christian People.*

P O I N T XXII.

PROTESTANTS hold, That Confirmation is not, properly speaking any Sacrament of the New Law, ordained by Christ to give Grace.

Acts c.
viii. v. 14.

Contrary to the written Word. 1. *Now when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their Hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost.*

Acts c.
xv. v. 5.

2. *When they heard this, they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his Hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them. And they spake with Tongues and Prophesied.*

3. *There-*

3. Therefore leaving the Principles *Heb. c. vi. v. 1, 2*
of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go unto
Perfection; not laying again the founda-
tion of Repentance, from dead Works, and
of Faith towards God, of the Doctrine of
Baptisms, and of laying on of Hands, &c.

If a Sacrament of the New Law, be
an outward and visible Sign of inward *Short Ca-*
and spiritual Grace, given unto us, or- *techism of*
dained by Christ himself, as a Means *the Church*
whereby we receive the same; here in *of Eng-*
Confirmation, as it was given in the *land.*
Apostolical Church by the Apostles
themselves, we have the outward and
visible Sign, which is the laying on of
Hands of the Apostles; here was also
inward and spiritual Grace, which was
the Holy Ghost received by this Means,
by the new baptized; And that this
sacred Ceremony was ordained by Christ,
as a Means to impart this Grace, is
very plain, because the Apostles could
not of themselves institute a Sacrament
to give Grace: For which Reason this
Doctrine of the laying on of Hands,
(or Confirmation) is by the Apostle
in the Text last cited, numbred toge-
ther with Baptism, among the Prin-
ciples of the Doctrine of Christ: Is not
this a good Proof from the Written
Word, that it is one of the Sacraments
of

of the New Law, ordained by him to give Grace?

P O I N T XXIII.

PROTESTANTS hold, That Extreme-Union is not one of the Sacraments of the New Law, ordained by Christ to give Grace; nor to be administered to the Sick.

Contrary to the exprefs Words of St. James the Apostle. *Is any Sick among you? Let him call for the Elders (Priests) of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oyl in the name of the Lord; and the Prayer of Faith shall save the Sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed Sins they shall be forgiven him.*

James c.
v. v. 14.

It cannot be disputed that this sacred Ceremony of anointing the Sick with Oyl, was instituted by our Saviour, since it is here taught us by one of the Apostles, and it is utterly incredible that one of the twelve Apostles should Err in a matter of such Moment, or take upon himself to promise Grace and Remission of Sins, as St. James does to those who make a pious Use of this Rite

Rite of the Church, unless he knew that it was of *divine Institution*.

To this Protestants reply, That this anointing of the Sick mentioned by St. James is the same with that mentioned in the Gospel of St. Mark: *Mark. c.*

And they cast out many Devils, and vi c. 13. anointed with Oyl many that were Sick and healed them: Which, say they, was a miraculous Gift of healing the Sick of their corporal Diseases, that was to last only during the Age of the Apostles, and for some time after, but not a Sacrament of divine Institution to endure for ever in the Church.

But this exception of Protestants against the Sacrament of Extreme-Union can not stand its Ground. For in the first Place, all Priests are here empowered to anoint the Sick: Yet all Priests in St. James's time had not the miraculous Gift of healing the Sick mentioned by St. Mark; therefore this Rite of anointing the Sick mentioned by St. James, is not that miraculous Gift of healing the Sick mentioned by St. Mark: Secondly, many others in the primitive Church besides the Apostles and Priests had the Gift of curing Diseases mentioned by St. Mark; yet the anointing of the Sick in St. James was only to be administered by Priests, this

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal,

this again proves that it is not the same mentioned by *St. Mark*. *Thirdly*, no Oyl except it be the Matter of some Sacrament of divine Institution, can be a means to remit Sin, and to impart Health to Soul as well as Body; but it is expressly said of this *Anointing* commanded by *St. James*. *That it shall save the Sick, and if he have committed Sins they shall be forgiven him*, which Words plainly signify, that it heals the Soul as well as the Body: We conclude, that this *Anointing* of the Sick which we read of in *St. James* is a Sacrament ordained by Christ, to give Grace and Remission of Sins, and cannot be the same with that mentioned in *St. Mark*; which was a Gift of healing the Sick only of their corporal Diseases.

Now, this Sacrament was certainly administred to the Sick in the *Apostolical Church*, as *St. James* one of the twelve Apostles witnesses; yet in none of the reformed Churches of Protestants is this Sacrament to the Sick administred; therefore none of the reformed Churches are the true *Apostolical Church*, which is proved by this Token, because they use not the same Sacraments as the Apostles did; whereas according to Protestants themselves, a due Admini-
stration.

stration of Sacraments is one of the principal Marks by which the true Church is distinguished, which is certainly so far true, that whatever Church has laid aside any one of the Sacraments of the New Law, ordained by Christ for the Salvation of Mankind, whether for the Sick or those in Health, whether for the living or the dying, the Church of Christ that cannot be.

P O I N T XXIV.

PROTESTANTS hold, That *Holy Orders* is not one of the Sacraments of the New Law ordained by Christ to confer Grace.

Contrary to the written Word of God. 1. *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* 1 Tim. c. iv. v. 14.

2. *Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.* 2 Tim. c. i. v. 6.

3. *And when they had prayed they laid their hands on them: The seven Deacons mentioned in the Acts.* Acts c. vi. v. 5.

4. And

Acts. xiv.

v. 23.

Χειροτο-

νισαν-

τες.

14. And when they had ordained them Elders, (Priests) with laying on of hands (as the Greek has it) in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed.

The three things essential to a Sacrament of the New Law, are here also found in Ordination. First, The outward and visible sign, which is, laying on of hands, mentioned both in the Ordina-

Acts c. vi.

Acts. xiv.

1 Tim. iv.

2 Tim. i.

tion of Deacons, and in the Ordination of Priests, and in the Ordination of Bishops. Secondly, Here is also the inward or spiritual Grace of the Sacrament mentioned both in the first and second Epistle to Timothy, as also in St. John, where our Saviour giving to the Apostles the Power to forgive Sins, which is a principal part of Priesthood, first imparted to them the Holy Ghost, saying;

Chap. iv.

v. 14.

Chap. i.

v. 6.

receive ye the Holy Ghost. Thirdly, That it was ordained by Christ, who can doubt! For will any one be so impious as to say, that Ordination mentioned in so many places of Scripture was a meer human Invention of the Apostles? Besides, how came the Gift of God, the Gift of Grace to be connected with an outward Ceremony of laying on of hands as is abovementioned in the Text, un-

Jo. c. xx.

v. 21.

less

less it were of Divine Institution? For we know the Apostles had not Power to institute Sacraments that give Grace. Those Divines who maintain the contrary Doctrine, that holy Orders is no Sacrament that gives Grace, do they not give themselves a terrible blow? For if holy Orders gives not Grace, on what account do they prefer themselves to the Laity? If Ordination be not of *Divine Institution* but *human*, then it may be laid aside by *human Authority*, if Occasion require, and that *Order of Men* be entirely abolished.

Quakers and some other Protestants reply: That *laying on of hands* or Ordination is not needful to them, who have in them already the Spirit of God, the inward Uction of the Holy Ghost, which of itself sufficiently authorizes any one to administer and preach the Word of God, without any farther Ceremony.

I answer, that this Doctrine was unheard of in the Church whilst it was governed by the Apostles: For in those times we read, that Bishops, Priests and Deacons were constantly ordained by *the laying on of hands*, nor might any presume to preach and administer the Sacraments, unless they were first so ordained

ordained and sent by those who had in like manner been ordained lawful Pastors in the Church before them.

Nay even St. Paul, tho' he had an immediate Call to the Apostleship from the mouth of our Saviour himself, yet
Acts c. ix. v. 15, 16. was afterwards *ordained with the laying on of hands* by the Apostles, and so sent to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, as
Chap. xiii. v. 2. we read in the *Acts*. *As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said: Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the Work whereunto I have called them; and when they had fasted and prayed and laid hands on them they sent them away.* Altho' St. Paul and Barnabas were called by the Holy Ghost, as the Scripture here testifies, and St. Paul by God the Father, and by God the Son, and by God the Holy Ghost, as himself declares; yet, we see, they were afterwards ordained with the usual Ceremony of *laying on of hands*. This extraordinary Example recorded in holy Writ, is a most convincing Proof that *Ordination* is a Sacrament of *Divine Institution*, and therefore indispensably necessary, to all who enter into the sacred Ministry, not even St. Paul himself excepted; who if he had not been *ordained*, had not partaken of the Priesthood.

Gal. c. i.

v. 1.

Acts c. ix.

v. 15.

Acts c.

xiii. v. 2.

hood. And that it is high and sacrilegious Presumption, for any Man (much more a Woman) to take upon him to preach the Gospel, to administer Sacraments, and to have the care of Souls, unless he is first ordained and sent, by those who were ordained lawful Pastors in the Church before him, according to the Sacrament which God has instituted.

Verily, verily I say unto you, he that Jo. c. x. entereth not by the Door into the Sheep- v. 1. fold, but climbeth up some other Way, the same is a Thief and a Robber. Now, it is as plain as the Sun in the Firmament, that none but the Bishops and Priests of the *Roman* Catholick Church have derived their Ordinantion and Mission from the Apostles, and that the Pastors of all other Churches have *climbed up into the Fold by another Way*: Consequently they are ——— as is above said in the Text.

P O I N T XXV.

PROTESTANTS hold, That Marriage is not one of the Sacraments of the New Law that confers sanctifying Grace:

H

Con-

Ephes. c.

v. v. 31,

32.

Contrary to the holy Scripture. 1. For *this Cause shall a Man leave his Father and Mother and shall be joined unto his Wife, and they two shall be one Flesh. This is a great Mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.*

Ephes. c.

v. v. 24.

v. 25.

2. Therefore as the Church is Subject unto Christ. So let Wives be to their own Husbands in every thing: Husbands love your Wives, even as Christ, also loved the Church, and gave himself for it.

Matrimony is a holy State, instituted of God in the time of Man's innocency, and Consecrated by Christ to such an excellent Mystery, that in it is signified and represented the spiritual Marriage and Unity, betwixt Christ and his Church. So says the Church of England in the solemnizing of it. Whereby Protestants themselves seem to confess, that our Saviour Christ added something to Marriage which it had not before; it being now by him made an excellent Mystery; whereas if it be regarded only as a civil or natural Contract, there is nothing Mysteious in it. Now if Marriage be an excellent Mystery, on this Account, because it is now instituted to figure, and represent the spiritual Marriage between Christ and the Church; which according

according to St. Paul is figured by the Love of the Husband for the Wife; even as Christ loved the Church; and by the Subjection of the Wife to her Husband, even as the Church is Subject unto Christ; which cannot be without spiritual Grace. We conclude from Scripture expounded by the Tradition of all Ages, that Marriage was by our Saviour Christ made one of the Sacraments of the New Law, to confer upon the Married-Couple that sanctifying Grace, without which, the spiritual Marriage between Christ and the Church cannot be perfectly represented.

P O I N T XXVI.

PROTESTANTS maintain: That the Honour which is given to Angels and Saints in the Church of Rome, is no better than Idolatry.

Contrary to the written Word of God.

1. Honour and Glory and Peace to every Man that worketh Good. Rom. c. ii. v. 10.

2. And when the Sons of the Prophets which were to view at Jericho, saw him, they said: The Spirit of Elijah does rest 2 Kings c. ii. v. 15.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

on Elisha, and they came to meet him
and bowed to the Ground before him.

1 Kings c.

xviii. v. 7.

3. And as Obadiah was in the Way
behold, Elijah met him: And he knew
him, and fell on his Face, and said, art
thou that my Lord Elijah?

Joshua c.

v. v. 14.

4. And he said, nay, But as Captain
of the Host of the Lord am I now come.
And Joshua fell on his Face to the Earth,
and did worship.

Here are several Instances in the
written Word of holy Persons, who paid
an outward Reverence and Honour by
bowing down, and prostrating on the
Ground to Saints; and an instance of
one who paid the like Honour to an
Angel, tho' he knew by the Testimony
of the Angel himself, that he was not
more than an Angel. Yet when *Roman*
Catholicks pay the like Reverence and
Honour to Saints and Angels, as *Joshua*
and these other holy Persons did, they
are immediately accused of Superstition
and Idolatry by Protestants. But the
Reason why there was not the least
Tincture of Idolatry in what *Joshua* and
these other holy Persons here did, was
because they were all Adorers of the true
God, as *Roman* Catholicks now are,
and therefore never had one thought
of

of giving *Divine Honour* to his Creatures, but only to shew a due Respect and Reverence to the Saints and Angels, on Account of the eminent Relation they have to God. Which is so far from being a Dishonour to him, that he would much rather think himself dishonoured, if that Respect which is due to all holy things and Persons that relate to him, were not, in due Circumstances and with due measure, paid.

Protestants reply, That when *St. John* fell down at the Angel's Feet, and would have worshipped him; *see thou do it not*, says the Angel, *I am thy fellow* *Rev. c. Servant; worship God.* Is not this a *xix. v. 10.* plain Argument, that whatever Worship is paid, in a Religious way, is due to God alone?

“ I Answer, That it is a plain Argu- Catholick
 “ ment of no such thing, For *St. John* Answer to
 “ was far from offering to any Creature Mr. Bar-
 “ the Worship *due to God alone.* The ret. § 19.
 “ Worship then that *St. John* offered
 “ the Angel was only an *Inferior Wor-*
 “ *ship*, upon the Consideration of his
 “ being a Messenger from God, a happy
 “ and glorious Spirit. Yet the Angel
 “ to teach us Modesty and Humility
 “ refused even that *Inferior Worship*
 “ (tho' Lawful) upon the Consideration,

“ not of the happy Condition he was
 “ in above St. *John*, but of what he
 “ had in common with him, the being
 “ *fellow Servant* with him of Jesus
 “ Christ, who by his Incarnation had
 “ assumed not Angelical, but Human
 “ Nature. So that upon different Con-
 “ siderations (for who dare either blame
 “ the Angel or the Apostle?) both the
 “ the holy Apostle St. *John* commen-
 “ dably offered an *Inferior Worship* to
 “ the Angel, and the holy Angel on
 “ his side commendably refused it.

“ Can any one think, that St. *John*
 “ the beloved Apostle of Christ, by
 “ Christ himself taught and educated,
 “ and by the Holy Ghost filled and
 “ perfected, can any one think, I say,
 “ that St. *John* understood so little
 “ of Religion, as not to know what
 “ Honour and Worship was due to the
 “ blessed Angels? On the contrary, I
 “ find the Apostles were altogether
 “ positive as to the knowing the Points
 “ of their Religion. If, says St. *Paul*,
 “ *An Angel from Heaven preach any*
 “ *other Gospel unto you, than that which*
 “ *we have preached unto you, let him*
 “ *be accursed.* And a most plain Ar-
 “ gument that the Angel in the Text
 “ above mentioned, did not refuse the
 Worship

Gal. c. i.
v. 8.

" Worship offered him by St. *John* as
 " *Idolatrous, Unlawful, or Sinful, a*
 " most plain Argument, I say, of this
 " may be gathered from the *Revela-*
 " *tions* c. xxii. v. 8, 9. Where St. *John*
 " a second time offered the Angel the
 " same Worship as before, notwith-
 " standing the Angel had so lately
 " refused it. *Revelations* xix. v. 10.
 " For if any Fault there was in it,
 " how is it possible that St. *John* having
 " been but just before warned of it,
 " how is it possible he should, after that,
 " relapse again into the same Fault, in-
 " to so great a Fault?"

" Neither does St. *Paul*, *Col.* ii.
 " v. 18. forbid us to worship An-
 " gels with such a Worship as is usual
 " in the Catholick Church, that is,
 " with a *subordinate and inferior Wor-*
 " *ship*; but what he forbids us is, to
 " worship them with an *extravagant*
 " and *superstitious Worship*, that is, he
 " forbids us to worship them so, as
 " to exclude the *Mediatorship of Christ*,
 " so as to deny *the Head* Christ Jesus.
 " *Not holding the Head*, says he, v. 19,
 " &c. But so far are Catholicks from
 " giving to the Angels this latter kind
 " of Worship, that they detest the
 H 4 " thought

The PROTESTANT's Tryal

“ thought of it. On the contrary, they
 “ constantly profess, whatsoever the
 “ Saints and Angels obtain for us of
 “ God, that it is all through the *Me-*
 “ *diatorship of Christ*. All through
 “ Jesus Christ the *Head* both of them
 “ and us.”

Luke c. xi.
v. 27, 28.

But, says the Protestant, does our Saviour give us Encouragement any where in the Gospel, to pay those Honours to the Virgin *Mary* his Mother, which are paid her by the Church of *Rome*? No, so far from it, that he signifies that to be a true Disciple of Christ, is a far more valuable Title than that of a Mother.

“ We answer: It is true that to be
 “ a Disciple of Christ is a more valu-
 “ able Title than that of a Mother,
 “ but to be both Mother and Disciple
 “ is the most valuable of all. The
 “ Virgin *Mary* then being both, the
 “ Mother of Christ, which is a valu-
 “ able Title, and his true *Disciple* too
 “ which is a more valuable Title, be-
 “ ing, I say, both Mother and true
 “ Disciple, not only true Disciple, but
 “ of all Disciples the *truest* and the
 “ *best*, she is therefore worthy of all
 “ the Honours paid her by the Church
 “ of

“ of Rome. Blessed is she among Wo- Luke c. i.
 “ men; all Generations shall call her v. 42.
 “ Blessed.” Luke c. i.
v. 48.

All Honour is not Divine Honour; unless we hold that most absurd position of Quakers, that bowing the Body, uncovering the Head, prostrating, and all the outward Marks of Reverence which Men usually shew to one another, is giving to Men the honour due to God. But if *all Honour is not Divine*, then we may honour Saints and Angels with an *inferior Honour* which is not *Divine*, nor consequently has any Tincture of Idolatry in it. As to outward Marks and Testifications of Honour, it is certain, many of these, as *kneeling, bowing, prostrating*, are of themselves indifferent, and are applied by the inward Intention; so that when we see one who is an Adorer of the true God kneel to the King, we conclude that nothing but *Civil Honour* is meant by it; and when we see the same Person kneeling in a Church to pray and adore God, that we know to be *Divine Honour*; and when we see the same Person kneeling before the Shrine of a Saint to implore his Intercession we know that being a Worshiper of the true God as all *Roman Catholicks* are,

it is far from his Intention to pay *Divine Honour* to his Creatures: And tho' the outward Ceremony is the same the inward Devotion is not.

P O I N T XXVII.

PROTESTANTS maintain, That to esteem certain Places to be *Holy*, and shew outward Marks of Reverence to such Places is one of the Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*.

But in this Point the Church of *Rome* is guided by the written Word of God. 1. *And the Captain of the Lord's Host said unto Joshua, loose thy Shoe from off thy Foot, for the Place whereon thou standest is Holy.*

Joshua c.
v. v. 16.

2. *And he said, draw not nigh hither; put off thy Shoes, from off thy Feet, for the Place whereon thou standest is Holy Ground.*

Exod. c.
iii. v. 5.

Here let Protestants observe, that *Moyse* and *Joshua* were commanded, one by God himself, and the other by an Angel, to go barefoot out of reverence to the Ground wheron they stood, because it was *Holy*. For this Reason, *Roman Catholicks* reverence all Places as
holy

holy Places, where God has at any time appeared, or manifested some Ray of his Glory, or conferred signal Benefits upon Mankind, as Mount *Sinai*, *Horeb*, the Places of our Saviour's Nativity, Passion, Burial, Resurrection and Ascension, which are held by us to be *holy Places*, for the same Reason that the Mountain upon which he was Transfigured, is by St. Peter called *the holy Mount*. ^{2 Pet. c. i. v. 18.}

P O I N T XXVIII.

PROTESTANTS maintain, That Water, Bread, Oyls, and other Creatures, cannot be, by the Blessings, Prayers, and Consecrations of the Church, sanctified or made more holy than they are by their first Creation.

Contrary to the exprefs Words of St. Paul, and to the Gospel of Christ.

1. *Ye Fools and Blind, for whether is Matth. c. greater, the Gold or the Temple which xxiii. v. sanctifieth the Gold.* 17.

2. *Ye Fools and Blind, for whether v. 19. is greater, the Gift or the Altar which sanctifieth the Gift.*

If

If the Temple sanctified the *Gold*, and the Altar the *Gift* that was offered upon it, this is a good Proof that whatever is separated from common Uses, and consecrated to Religion and God's Worship, does thereby become *Holy* and *Sacred*.

1 Tim. c.
iv. v. 4, 5.

3. *For every Creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with Thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the Word of God and Prayer.*

Here it is expressly taught, that altho' every Creature was by the Hand of God made *good* in the first Creation, they may yet be sanctified and made more *Holy* by *the Word of God and Prayer*, by the Prayers and Blessings of the Church.

Cal. l. iv.
Institut. c.
x. § 12.

Protestants still insist, That the Blessings and Consecrations of Oyls, Water, and other Elements against Diseases and evil Spirits are Superstitions of the *Romish* Church, much like the *Enchantments* and *Invocations* of the antient Idolaters and Magicians.

But let them consider whether themselves in this Point, do not condemn the Gospel of Christ.

Mark. c.
vi v. 13.

1. *And they cast out many Devils, and anointed with Oyl many that were Sick, and healed them.*

2. *For*

2. For an Angel went down at a certain Season into the Pool, and troubled the Water: whosoever then, first after the troubling of the Water, stepped in, was made whole of whatsoever Disease he had. Jo. c. v. v. 4.

I hope these Texts will extort this Confession at least, from the Mouths even of the most obstinate Protestants, that Water, Oyls, and other inanimate Creatures, may possibly have a Blessing imparted to them from God, and be used by him as Instruments to cast out evil Spirits, and to cure Diseases, Witness the miraculous Pool of Water, mentioned by St. *John*, and the Oyl mentioned by St. *Mark*. Now the Blessings of Water, &c. which are in use in the Catholick Church, what are they but Forms of Prayer, beseeching God to give a Blessing to these Creatures against Diseases and evil Spirits? Is it then Superstition to believe that God hears these Invocations of his Church, to which, we know he has given a Power over all Devils, and over all the Power of the Enemy? Luke c. ix. v. 1. Chap. x. v. 19.

But do not these Invocations and Blessings, so much used in the Church of *Rome*, very much resemble the Enchantments of Magicians, and the antient Idolaters? So

So far from it, that they are directly opposite to each other in every Respect. The Magicians and Idolaters in their Enchantments, supplicate Devils and false Gods: The Catholick Church in the *Blessings* of Water, Oyls, &c. supplicates the only true and living God. The Magicians in their Enchantments work by the Power of the Devil: The Catholick Church, in the Blessings of these Creatures, relies on the Power of Christ which he gave to his Apostles, and to his Church *over all Devils*. In the Enchantments of Magicians the Devil shews his Power over wicked Men: In the Blessing of Holy-water, Christ shews his Power over the Devil. So that to say these holy Rites of the Catholick Church bear a Likeness and Resemblance to the Enchantments of Magicians and Idolaters, when one invokes Demons, the other the true God; when one works by the Power of the Devil, the other by the Power of God *over all Devils*, is surely such a Likeness, such a Resemblance, such a Comparison, as can never enter into the Thoughts of any, but those, who think there is neither God nor Devil, and consequently no difference between invoking one or the other.

POINT

P O I N T XXIX,

PROTESTANTS hold, That Religious Men and Women who have vowed perpetual Continency, may lawfully Marry notwithstanding their Vows.

Contrary to the exprefs Words of their Bible. 1. *When thou shalt Vow* Deut. c. xxiii. v. 21. *a Vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to Pay it: for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; but if thou shalt forbear to Vow, it shall be no Sin in thee.* v. 22. *That which is* v. 23. *gone out of they Lips, thou shalt keep and perform.*

2. *If thou hast Vowed any thing to* Ecclesiast. c. v. v. 3. *God, do not slak to Pay it; for a* 4. *foolish and unfaithful Promise is displeasing to him; but whatever thou shalt Vow Pay it.*

Here the Divine Law, as well as the Law of Nature, teaches that a Promise made to God, which we call a Vow of such things as are well pleasing to him, binds the Votaries in Conscience: The next Point to be proved is, that perpetual Continency is a Virtue well pleasing to God, which is proved from
 St.

- Chap. vii. St. Paul; in his first to the *Corinthians* :
 v. 32, 33, *He that is unmarried careth for the*
 &c. *things that belong to the Lord, how he*
may please the Lord. But he that is
 v. 34. *married careth for the Things that are*
of the World, how he may please his
Wife. The unmarried Woman
careth for the things of the Lord, that
she may be holy, both in Body and in
Spirit. But she that is married, careth
 v. 38. *for the Things of the World, how she*
may please her Husband. So then
he that giveth his Virgin in marriage,
doth well, but he that giveth her not
in marriage, doth better.

i Cor. c. Now, if on the one Hand St. Paul
 vii. v. 40. *by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost,*
 teaches us in the clearest manner, and
 recommends Virginitie, an unmarried
 Life, perpetual Continency, as the greater
 Good, the more perfect State of Life,
 more pleasing to God; and if on the
 other Hand, whosoever has Vowed any
 thing to God, which is pleasing to him,
 as every Virtue is, and as we know
 from the Apostle *perpetual Continency*
 is by the Divine Law, is strictly bound
 in Conscience to perform it; it most
 clearly follows, that Religious Men and
 Women who have Vowed perpetual
 Continency, and that in the most so-
 lemn

leem manner, cannot lawfully marry, and such as do are Vow-breakers and Apostates. Where then will they appear at the Day of Judgment, who pulled down Monasteries, seized the Abby-Lands, and licensed Religious Men and Women, to marry contrary to their Vow? And what Opinion ought we to have of a Reformation, which taught all these wicked and Sacrilegious Doings, and still upholds the same Vow-breaking Doctrine, in direct Contradiction to the *written Word of God?*

If Protestants reply, that Continency is a free Gift of God, and therefore no one knowing whether it will be hereafter in his Power ought not to Vow it; and if a Priest or Religious Person after his Vow, finds it not in his Power, he may lawfully marry, remembering the saying of the Apostle, *that it is better to Marry than Burn.* In Answer to this Exception, let them know, that *Continency* is no otherwise a Gift of God, than Justice, Temperance and every other Virtue, which may therefore be obtained of God by Prayer, providing they neglect not the ordinary Preservatives of it, which are Abstinence, Fasting, Mortification and a strict divorce

Wisdom

c. viii.

Matth. c.

xix. v. 11.

1 Cor. c.

vii. v. 9.

James c.

i. v. 17.

divorce from too great Familiarities with Persons of another Sex. Contineny then may as well be the matter of a Vow as any other Virtue, and such Vow, when made, does by the Divine Law strictly bind the Votaries in Conscience.

P O I N T XXX.

PROTESTANTS maintain, That Mortification of the Flesh, and an austere Way of Life, is meer Folly and Superstition.

Contrary to the written Word of God. *1. And the same John had his Rayment of Camel's-hair, and Leathern-girdle about his Loins; and his Meat was Locusts and wild Honey.*

Luke c. iii. v. 2. The Gospel also testifies of St. John, that he led an Eremitical Life in the Desert. Here then the Gospel presents us with an Example of a Saint, of one

Matth. c. xi. v. 9. v. 11. *who was more than a Prophet; than whom a greater had not risen among the Born of Women, who led an austere and mortified Life, both as to his Habitation, and as to his Diet, and as to his Cloathing.*

2. And

2. *And they that are Christ's have crucified their Flesh, with the Affections and Lusts.* Gal. c. v. v. 24.

3. *Always bearing about in the Body, the Dying of the Lord Jesus, that the Life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our Body.* 2 Cor. c. iv. v. 10.

4. *I chastise my Body and bring it into Subjection, lest whilst I preach to others, I my self become a Reprobate.* 1 Cor. c. ix. v. 27.

If so great a Person as St. Paul did not think himself secure of Heaven, without Mortification of the Body as well as the *Will*, how can our pampered Protestants arrive thither without it? Let them at least own the Truth, that an austere mortified Life, such as many holy Eremites and other holy Persons follow in the Catholick Church, and such as all Christians who aspire to eternal Life, must more or less partake of, is not *Folly and Superstition*, but recommended to us by the Doctrine of holy Scripture, and by the Example of the greatest Saints; let them not blame that in others, which they have not the Courage and Virtue to undertake themselves.



P O I N T XXXI.

PROTESTANTS hold, That Abstinence and Fasting from certain Meats in *Lent*, and upon other Fasts commanded by the Church, is Folly and Superstition not grounded in the *written Word of God*.

1 Kings.
c. xxi. v.
27.

v. 28.

Contrary to innumerable Texts both of their Bible and Testament. 1. *And it came to pass when Achab heard these Words, that he rent his Clothes and put on Sack-cloth, and went softly. And the Word of the Lord came to Elijah the Tishbite saying: Seest thou how Achab humbleth himself before me? Because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the Evil in his Days; but in his Son's Days, will I bring the Evil upon his House.*

v. 25.

Pf. xxxv.

v. 13.

Pf. lxix.

v. 10.

Here we see in holy Writ, how Fasting and Penance pacified the Wrath of God, and moved him to spare even wicked *Achab*, of whom it is said in the same Chapter, that *there was not such another for Wickedness in the Sight of the Lord.*

2. *I humbled my Soul with Fasting. When I wept and chastened my Soul with Fasting, that was to my reproach.*

My

*My Knees are weak thro' Fasting, and my Psalm cix.
Flesh faileth of Fatness.* v. 24.

Here is Fasting recommended by the example of King David, who is a perfect Pattern as well of Sanctity to Saints, as of Penance to Sinners.

3. *Whenever a Man or Woman shall separate themselves to Vow a Vow of a Nazarite, to separate themselves unto the Lord: he shall separate himself from Wine, and Strong-drink, and shall drink, no Vinegar of Wine, or Vinegar or Strong-drink, neither shall he drink any Liquor of Grapes, nor eat moist Grapes or dried.* Numbers c. vi. v. 2, 3.

4. *And I set before the Sons of the House of the Rechabites, Pots full of Wine and Cups, and I said unto them, drink ye Wine. But they said, we will drink no Wine: For Jonadab the Son of Rechab, our Father commanded us, saying; ye shall drink no Wine, neither ye, nor your Sons for ever. Thus have we obeyed the Voice of Jonadab, the Son of Rechab our Father. Therefore thus saith the Lord of Hosts; the God of Israel; Jonadab the Son of Rechab shall not want a Man to stand before me for ever.* Jerem. c. xxxv. v. 5, 6. &c. v. 8. v. 19.

I suppose Protestants must allow this Fast of the Nazarites and Rechabites, was a Fast from certain Meats and Strong-Liquors, and not only from Sin: Yet is this

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

this Fast of the *Rechabites* here approved, and that of the *Nazarites* instituted by God himself.

2 Chron.
c. xx. v.
2, 3.

5. *Then there came some that told Jehosaphat, saying, there cometh a great Multitude against thee, from beyond the Sea on this side Syria, and behold they be in Hazazon-tamar, which is En-gedi, and Jehoshaphat feared, and set himself to seek the Lord, and proclaimed a Fast throughout all Juda.*

See with what Devotion this pious King in time of an imminent Danger betook himself to Prayer and Fasting.

Dan. c.
ix. v. 3.

6. *And I set my face unto the Lord God to seek by Prayer and Supplications, with Fasting, and Sack-cloth, and Asbes.*

Here is Fasting again recommended by the Example of the Prophet Daniel.

Joel c. ii.
v. 12.

7. *Therefore also now, saith the Lord, turn ye even to me with all your Heart, and with Fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning.*

Is not Fasting here preached to all by the Word of God from the mouth of a Prophet?

Jonah c.
iii. v. 5.

8. *So the People of Niniveh believed God, and proclaimed a Fast: And put on Sack-cloth from the greatest of them, even to the least of them. And God saw their Works that they turned from their*

their evil way, and God repented of the v. 10. evil that he had said that he would do unto them, and he did it not.

Protestants must not pretend that this celebrated Fast of the *Ninivites* was only a *Fast from Sin*, for the Scripture itself testifies that from Meat and Drink they fasted. *And he caused it to be proclaimed through Niniveh (by a decree of the King and his Nobles) saying, let neither Man nor Beast, Herd nor Flock taste any thing; let them not feed, nor drink water.* So strict was this Fast, that not one Bit of Bread did they eat, not one Drop of Water did they drink during the time appointed for the Fast; nor can it be questioned, whether this their Fasting was acceptable to God, since the *written Word* here assures us, that it pacified the Wrath of God, and obtained Pardon for this wicked City, even when his Almighty Arm was lifted up for their Destruction.

9. Go gather together all the Jews *Ester. c. iv. v. 16.* that are present in Shushan, and Fast ye for me, and neither eat nor drink three days, night or day: I also and my Maidens will Fast likewise, and so will I go in unto the King.

Here we have another Instance in *holy Writ* of a Fast not from Sin only, but

but a three days Fast from Meat and Drink, which joined with humble Prayer, obtained of Heaven the Deliverance of all the *Jews* in *Persia* from the general Massacre that was intended against them.

Ezra. c.

viii. v. 21.

10. *Then I proclaimed a Fast there at the River Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before our God, to seek of him a right way for us, and for our little ones, and for all our Substance.*

Nehemiah

c. i. v. 4.

11. *And it came to pass when I heard these words, that I sat down and wept, and mourned certain days, and fasted and prayed before the God of Heaven.*

Thus is holy Fasting recommended throughout the Old Testament, both by the Doctrine and Example of the Saints and Prophets. Now I proceed to set down the Texts that speak for it in the New.

Matth. c.

vi. v. 17.

1. *But when thou fastest anoint thine Head and wash thy Face: that thou appear not unto Men to Fast, but unto thy Father which is in Secret: and thy Father which seeth in Secret, shall reward thee openly.*

It must be granted that the Fast which our Saviour here commends, is a Fast from Meat and Drink, not from Sin; for it cannot be supposed that our Saviour

Saviour Christ commanded his Disciples to anoint their Heads and wash their Faces, while they *Fast from Sin*, the better to disguise themselves that they might not *appear to Men to Fast from Sin*. The Gospel then speaks of Fasting from Meat and Drink; and at the same time a Reward is promised to it, that none may doubt of its being a meritorious Work.

2. *And when he had fasted forty Days and forty Nights, he was afterwards anhungred.* Matth. c. iv. v. 2.

Was not this an unexceptionable Example for the Church of Christ, to follow in the Institution of the forty Days Fast of Lent?

3. *Then came to him the Disciples of John, saying, why do we and the Pharisees Fast often, but thy Disciples Fast not? And Jesus said unto them; can the Children of the Bride-chamber mourn, as long as the Bride-groom is with them? But the Days will come when the Bride-groom shall be taken from them, and then shall they Fast.* Matth. c. ix. v. 14, 15.

Does not our Saviour in these Words prophesy, that when he should be taken away by his Death and Ascension into Heaven, then his Disciples and Church would in his Absence strictly observe the Discipline of Fasting? Now this Prediction

dition of our Saviour is fulfilled by Catholicks, who every Year Fast in *Lent* about the Time of our Saviour's Passion, which was the Time when the *Bridegroom was taken away*, and is therefore a time of Mourning and Penance in his Church.

Acts c.
xiii. v. 2,
3.

4. *As they ministred to the Lord and Fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the Work whereunto I have called them. And when they had Fasted and prayed and laid their Hands on them, they sent them away.*

Acts c. xiv.
v. 23.

5. *And when they had ordained them Elders (Priests) in every Church, and had prayed with Fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed.*

These Texts inform us, that it was a Custom in the *Apostolical Church* to Fast at the time of an *Ordination* of Bishops and Priests. Was not this a very proper Example for the Catholick Church to copy after, in the Fasts of the *Quatuor tempora* or *Ember-days*, which are the times appointed for *Ordination* in that Church?

2 Cor. c.
vi. v. 4, 5.

6. *But in all things approving ourselves as the Ministers of God, in much Patience, in Afflictions, in Necessities, in Distresses, in Stripes, in Imprisonments, in Tumults, in Labours, in Watchings, and in Fasting.*

7. In

7. In Weariness and Painfulness, in ^{2 Cor. c.}
Watchings often, in Hunger and Thirst, ^{xi. v. 27.}
in Fastings often, in Cold and Nakedness.

I have here collected in one View, all these Texts out of the Bible and Testament, that Protestants, who are every Day scoffing at the Fast of the Church of Rome, may see and contemplate how exactly their own Holy Religion does in this particular agree with the *written Word of God*.

Against the Fasts of the Church of Rome, they Object I. The Words of St. Paul to Timothy: *That in the latter* ^{1 Tim. c.}
times, some shall depart from the Faith, ^{iv. v. 1, 3.}
giving heed to seducing Spirits and Doctrines of Devils. Forbidding to Marry and commanding to abstain from Meats, which God has created to be received with Thanksgiving of them which believe and know the Truth. From whence the Learned among Protestants, as well as ignorant, pretend to draw this Conclusion; that the Church of Rome in commanding the Clergy to abstain from Marriage, and enjoining the Faithful to keep the Fast of Lent, and other Fasts, does teach the *Doctrine of Devils*: So Bishop Kiddar in his *Demonstration of the Messiah* interprets these Words of the Apostle.

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal

“ St. Paul, says the Bishop, not only
 “ foretels the coming of false Teachers,
 “ but he does most graphically set
 “ forth the very Doctrines which these
 “ Men should teach, viz. the Doctrines
 “ of Demons, and prohibiting of Mar-
 “ riages and Meats. This we know
 “ the Church of Rome has done.” So
 far the Bishop; to whom, the Jews,
 the Bishop writes against, might very
 well return this answer.

First, That either Christ was a false
 Prophet, when he promised and fore-
 told, that the Gates of Hell or infernal
 Powers should not prevail against his
 Church; whereas most certainly they
 have prevailed against it, if that Church
 has taught the *Doctrines of Devils*, as
 the Bishop pretends: which, if true, over-
 throws his *Demonstration of the Messiah*
 against the Jews. Or, *Secondly*, Paul the
 Apostle of Christ was a false Prophet,
 when he foretold, that the Church of
 Christ should in time to come, teach
 the *Doctrines of Devils*, against which
 Church Christ foretold the Gates of
 Hell should never prevail: Or, *Thirdly*,
 Bishop Kiddar has foully mistaken, the
 Sense both of St. Paul and Christ; which
 I very readily agree to. For the *Doctrines*
of Demons prohibiting Marriages and
Meats,

Meats, of which *St. Paul* prophesied, cannot be understood of the *Celibacy of Priests*, and the Fast of the Church, because these very Doctrines the Apostle himself both taught and practised; must we say then, that the Apostle himself taught *Devilish Doctrine*, when in his first Epistle to *Corinthians*, he strongly Chap. vii. recommends to both Sexes an unmarried Life, and perpetual Continency, as the much more holy State? And when in his second Epistle he recommends Fast- Chap. vi. ing as a most holy Exercise by his own v. 11. Example? What are these *Doctrines of v. 27. Demons*, then, which *St. Paul* speaks of? Chap. vi. v. 4, 5. They were the Doctrine of Hereticks, *Saturninus*, *Tatianus*, *Marcion*. The See *Tile-* *Adamites*, and *Manicheans*, who taught mot, Tom. that Marriage in itself is unlawful; 2. p. 231. that all Kinds of Flesh Meats were made p. 450. by an evil Genius, as also Wine (in the p. 296. Opinion of the *Manicheans*) and there- p. 280. fore, that these were not Food for Christians, as being of their own Nature, unclean and abominable. So that these Hereticks taught People to abstain from these things out of a dislike to them and to God their Maker. These are the Doctrines of *Demons*, which the Apostle speaks of; which we Catholics also detest as the Doctrine of lying

Spirits and a Blasphemy against God, the Creator of all things. But the unlearned part of Protestants meeting with these difficult Places in St. Paul's Epistles, and not being versed in those Points of History and Antiquity which are necessary for the clearing up the Sense of them, *they wrest them as they do also the other Scriptures to their own Destruction,* as St. Peter said of wavering Christians in his time.

2 Pet. c.
iii. v. 16.

They Object again, the Words of the
Chap. ii. Apostle to the Colossians. *Wherefore if*
v. 20, 21, *ye be dead with Christ from the Rudi-*
22. *ments of the World; why, as tho' living*
in the World, are ye subject to Ordina-
nces, (touch not, taste not, handle not,
which are all to Perish with the using)
after the Commandments and Doctrines
of Men. Here, say they, your Church-commandment of Fasting is plainly re-
proved by the Apostle.

But if so, what Opinion are we to have of his second Epistle to the Corinthians, where he informs us, that he was much devoted to Fasting himself? *In Labours, in Watchings, in Fastings. In Hunger and Thirst, and Fastings often.* It is well known from Scripture, that among the primitive Christians many there were converted from Judaism, who still
learned,

leaned, not a little, to their old Religion, principally such of them as had been formerly of the Sect of *Pbarisees*, the most *abstemious* of all the *Jews*, who endeavoured after their Conversion to revive again in Practice the legal Precepts of the *dead Law* of *Moyes*, in regard to clean and unclean Meats, and to touching such Things as by the *Mosaick Law* rendered a Person unclean; These, no doubt, are the Persons whom the Apostle rebukes when he warns the *Colossians*, not to be imposed upon by their *Ordinances*, *taste not*, *touch not*, *handle not*: But Protestants hearing the Apostle reprove those, who forbid *Marriages and Meats*; hearing him blame the Ordinances that were given out in his time by Judaising Christians, who forbid their Disciples, *to taste, touch or handle those Things*, which the Law of *Moyes* reputed unclean, they attend to the meer Sound of the Words without diving into the Meaning; and such unskilful Interpreters of Scripture are they, that they cannot distinguish the Fasts of the *Nazarites* and the *Rechabites*, the Fasts of *St. John Baptist*, and our Saviour Christ, the Fasts of the Apostles, the Prophets and other holy Penitents, which the

Scripture commends, from the superstitious Abstinence of Judaizing Christians, and from the impious Fasts of the *Manicheans*, and the Disciples of *Simon Magus*, which the Scripture-Doctrine condemns.

They return once more to the Charge with the Words of our Saviour in the *Matth. c. xv. v. 11.* Gospel. *Not that which goeth into the Mouth defileth a Man: but that which cometh out of the Mouth, this defileth a Man.* From whence they conclude, that he who believeth he may eat all things, as *Chap. iv. v. 2.* is said in the Epistle to the *Romans*, may safely in Conscience eat Flesh-Meat, upon all the Fasts of the Church: And to scruple at it, or think that eating Flesh-Meat on those Days more than others, can defile our Consciences is meer Superstition.

To whom we return this Answer, That the Words of our Saviour, *not that which goeth into the Mouth defileth a Man*, only import thus much: That no sort of Food which God has made, is by Nature unclean, and that Meat and Drink being a material Substance cannot defile the Soul which is of a spiritual Nature. But notwithstanding this most true Doctrine of our Saviour, the *Jews* might not eat Swine's-flesh, and

and other Meats which their Law forbid : Nor might the primitive Christians eat *Blood and things Strangled*, after the Prohibition, made by the Apostles in the Council of *Jerusalem*, under Pretence that *what goeth into the Mouth does not defile a Man* : Nor might Adam eat the Fruit of the *Tree of Knowledge*; under Pretence, that *it was Good for Food and pleasant to the Eyes* : For Gen. c. iii. v. 6. altho' the Fruit was Good, as was every other Thing which the Hand of God made ; and therefore it was not the Fruit which defiled him ; yet his Disobedience in eating *forbidding Fruit* defiled him and his Posterity too, and banished both out of *Paradise*. Let Protestants reflect well on this, when; without scruple and remorse of Conscience, they swallow down their delicious Morsels of *Flesh-meat* in *Lent*; and upon other Fasts commanded by that Church, which Christ commanded them to obey under pain of being accounted Heathens. For tho' they may flatter themselves with an Opinion, that the Meat which *goes into the Mouth* cannot defile them ; yet their Disobedience in eating *forbidden Meats*, their Spirit of Heresy, Schism, and Revolt against the Church of God, are what

Matth. c. xv. v. 18. *come forth of the Heart and that defiles a Man,* as our Saviour says in the very same Chapter of the Gospel, from whence this Objection of Protestants is taken.

Some Protestants reply, that Fasting itself they do not blame, but our Superstition, they think, lies in observing certain Days and Times fixed by the Church Precepts, which are but the *Commandments of Men*, and in believing it to be a Sin, to eat forbidden Meats on those Days.

But by a like Reason, they may prove that Children Sin not in disobeying their Parents; Servants in disobeying their Masters; Subjects in disobeying the Laws, because these are but the *Commandments of Men*. But the Truth is, that those who disobey *such Men*, whom God has commanded them to obey, do in effect disobey God himself.

Protestants, to evade this Charge, deny the Church has any Authority from God to make Laws that bind in Conscience.

Contrary to the express Word of God!

Heb. c. xiii. v. 17. *Obeys them that have the Rule over you, and submit yourselves: For they watch for your Souls, as they that must give Account.*

In this Text, I think the Apostle does as positively command all Christians to obey the Prelates of the Church in Spirituals, as he has elsewhere commanded them to obey Kings and Magistrates in Temporals.

2. *For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater Burthen than these necessary things; that ye abstain from Meats offered to Idols,, and from Blood and from Things strangled and from Fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well.* A^d.c. xv. v. 28, 29.

Here is a positive Precept of the Church, prohibiting the primitive Christians to eat *Blood and Things strangled*; which were of their own Nature indifferent, things neither essentially Good or Evil, and from which otherwise they were not obliged to abstain. And that this Church-Precept did bind them in Conscience, I have St. Paul for my warrant in the *Acts*. *And as they went through the Cities, they delivered to them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles and Elders that were at Jerusalem.* Chap. xvi, v. 4.

Now, if this Church-Precept was binding in Conscience, which no one ever disputed, then the Church which
has

Rom. c.
xiii. v. 2.

has the same Authority To-day as Yesterday, has in every Age and at all times been invested with a Power, to make Laws that bind in Conscience. In a Word, if temporal Princes are to be obeyed for Conscience sake, for this Reason, because their Power is approved of and ratified by God, and therefore those who resist the temporal Power resist the Ordinance of God, and shall receive to themselves Damnation; then those who resist the spiritual Power of the Church, resist the Ordinance of God too; because I suppose it will not be denied, that the spiritual Power of the Church is from Christ, and that the Church is in Possession of it by Divine right. Now, if the Precepts of the Church do all this while strictly bind in Conscience, what opinion ought Protestants to have of the Ringleaders, and Chiefs of their Reformation, who contrary to that fundamental Law of all Government, that no Laws can validly be repealed by an Authority inferior to that by which they were enacted; who, I say, nevertheless by their private Authority abolished at one stroke and annulled all the Precepts and Canons of the universal Church, which were heretofore made for regulating the Manners both of the Clergy and

and Laity; not contenting themselves with bare Disobedience to those Laws, but accompanying their Disobedience with that Kind of open Rebellion, against the *Authority itself* that made the Laws, which makes Men Schismaticks in Form? And if the Reformation, at its first setting up, stands charged with high Rebellion against the Universal Church both for disobeying its Laws, and denying its Authority, Protestants will do well to consider, whether they are more innocent, who at this day are engaged in the same Rebellion, and live in a continual breach of the same Church-Precepts and Canons.

They reply once more with the Words of our Saviour: *In vain do they* *Matth. c.*
Worship me, teaching for Doctrines the *xv. v. 9.*
Commandments of Men.

But if this be a Reason for refusing Obedience to Church-Precepts, for the same Reason, we may without Sin refuse Obedience to Kings and Magistrates, because their Laws too are but *the Commandments of Men.* What is the Reason then that Protestants are so very partial in this matter, in obeying the *Injunctions* of their temporal Princes, which are but the *Commandments of Men*, and why so very nice, so jealous, and
fearful.

fearful of Superstition in obeying the Precepts of the Church; which were made solely for their spiritual and eternal Good? What is the Reason that, according to the Divinity taught in this Nation, *the Commandments of Statesmen* bind in Conscience, and the *Commandments of Churchmen* do not? I know no Reason of all this, but that People in this Age and Country, are much better disposed to obey Men than God, and have a better regard for their temporal than spiritual Good.

But let us see what were these Doctrines and Commandments of Men, which our Saviour reprehends. It is plain to every one who looks into the Gospel, that they are the Traditions and Commandments of the Pharisees. *First*, such of their Traditions as were contrary to the Commandments of God, as were somethings they taught People in regard to their Parents. *Secondly*, Such Doctrines as were about frivolous things, and conduced to no Spiritual end; such were their frequent Purifications of their Hands and Vessels. *Thirdly*, Such Commandments as were given out by private Men who were not Authorized to make Laws for others. But the Precepts of the Church come under none
of

of these Heads. For *First*, These Precepts are not contrary to the Commandments of God, but grounded in the Doctrine he has taught us in holy Scripture; for instance of this, the Canons of the Church, which forbid Marriage to the Clergy, are grounded upon the Doctrine both of the Old and New Testament, which Counsel Continency and a single Life as the more holy and perfect State, especially for those who entirely devote themselves to the Service of God, and the care of Souls, which requires our whole Attendance, and cannot be so well discharged by those who are distracted with the Cares of a Family, and are divided between God and the World. Nor *Secondly*, are our Church-Precepts vain and frivolous, but such as clearly conduce to our spiritual Good. For instance, it clearly conduces to our spiritual Good to Fast, since we are assured, that none can be victorious through the whole course of their Lives, over that *Law of their Members*, which continually Fights against the Law of their Minds, unless they chastize their Bodies, and bring them into Subjection, which cannot be effected without some Kind of bodily Mortifications, of which fasting was ever esteemed to be one of the most

1 Cor. c.

vii.

Matth. c.

xix. v. 12.

1 Samuel

c. xxi. v.

4. 5.

Rom. c.

vii. v. 23.

1 Cor. c.

ix. v. 27.

most discreet. Nor *Thirdly*, are these Precepts issued out by such as are not Authorized to make Laws, but by *those who have the Rule over us*: by those Prelates whom the Holy Ghost has placed in the Church, to rule the Church of God: By those whom Christ has commanded us to hear as himself. How ridiculous then do they make themselves who think, that among the frivolous Traditions and arbitrary Commandments of the Pharisees which our Saviour condemned, he intended to include the Commandments of the Apostles and the Precepts, of his own Church.

P O I N T XXXII.

PROTESTANTS hold, That it is an unlawful Practice to perform the publick Service and Liturgy of the Church, in any Tongue but the Vulgar, that the People present may all hear and understand it.

Contrary both to their Bible and Testament. 1. *And there shall be no Man in the Tabernacle of the Congregation, when he goeth in to make an Atonement in the holy Place, until he come out and have made an Atonement for*

Levit. c.
xvi. v.
17.

for himself, and his Household and for all the Congregation of Israel.

2. And it came to pass while he (Zachary) executed the Priest's Office, before God in the order of his Course, according to the custom of the Priest's Office, his Lot was to Burn incense when he went into the Temple of the Lord, and the whole multitude of the People were praying without. Luke c. i. v. 8, 9, 10.

Here we find that the Priest in the time of the Old Law offered Sacrifice within the Tabernacle and the Temple, while the People were praying without; and so far were they from understanding all that was said, that they were forbid to be present where the Priest was; and neither saw nor heard him. It is not necessary therefore that the publick Service of the Church be so said, that all the People hear and understand it: But as it was sufficient for the People of God under the Old Law to know and understand, that the Sacrifice which was Offered, was a *Holocaust*, or *Sin-offering*, or *Peace-offering*, and that in those Sacrifices the Worship and Adoration of God consisted, tho' they neither saw nor heard the Priest, when he was making the Offering: In like manner it is sufficient, now for the People who assist.

assist at the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, to know that this Sacrifice was by our Saviour instituted, to fulfil and answer the Ends of all those antient Sacrifices; that it is both a Sacrifice of *Thanksgiving*, a *Propitiatory* Sacrifice, and that the Adoration of God consists in this Sacrifice, tho' the Assistants do not chance to understand the Language in which it is offered. The Reason is, because the principal intent of a Liturgy is not the same as that of a Sermon or Catechism, the Instruction of the People; but that a daily Tribute of Prayer, Thanksgiving and Adoration may be paid to God by the Priests of the Church, and that all Christians by their Presence, assenting and saying *Amen*, to these publick Prayers of the Church, may be Partakers of the Graces and Benefits which are obtained by them.

We must distinguish between *private Prayer* and *publick Prayer*: *Private Prayer*, is the People's Prayer for themselves: *Publick Prayer*, is the Priest's Prayer for the People, the Priest's Office not the People's. As to *private Prayer*, we advise every one to pray in a Language which he understands; but for the publick Service of the Church, it is not at all essential that those who are present must

must hear it spoke in the vulgar Tongue; because, it is not the People's Office, but the Priest's for the People; and may not *the Prayers of the Priest for the People* as soon penetrate the Heavens, and reach to the Throne of God, when they are worded in *Latin, Greek or Hebrew*, as if they were worded in the vulgar Tongue of every Country?

To this Protestants reply: That the Apostle forbids a Liturgy in an unknown Tongue, and brings many Reasons against it. *For if the Trumpet give* 1 Cor. c. xiv. v. 8.
an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the Battle? So likewise you, v. 9.
except ye utter by the Tongue Words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? For ye shall speak into the air. Wherefore let him that v. 13.
speaketh in an unknown Tongue, pray that he may interpret. For if I pray in an v. 14.
unknown Tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my Understanding is unfruitful. . . . Else v. 16.
when thou shalt blest with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen, at thy giving Thanks? Seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest. For thou verily givest v. 17.
Thanks well, but the other is not edified.

In these Words of the Apostle, Protestants think they have an unanswerable

The PROTESTANT'S *Tryal*

able Argument against a Liturgy in an unknown Tongue; which is a signal Instance of their Unskilfulness in interpreting Scripture, since it is evident that there is not one Word about the publick Liturgy of the Church, in all that Chapter. For the publick Service of the Church being undoubtedly performed at *Corinth* in the *Greek* Tongue, which was the vulgar Language of that Country, needed no such regulations as *St. Paul* here sets down for such as spoke and prayed in unknown Tongues.

To understand the Apostle, let Protestants know, that the *Gift of Tongues* which was given to the Apostles at the coming of the Holy Ghost, continued amongst the primitive Christians for a long time: This Gift they exercised in their publick Assemblies, either before or after the Liturgy was over, speaking some extemporary Prayer, or Prophecy, or Hymn, or Doctrine, in a Language which sometimes neither he that spoke, or any one present understood; in which *St. Paul* observing there was more of Ostentation than of Edification, he forbids them to utter those extemporary Prayers or Instructions in unknown Languages, unless they had the Gift of inter-

interpreting them themselves, or some one present could interpret for them.

Very well, says the Protestant, do not then *St. Paul's* Arguments equally strike at our Liturgy in an *unknown Tongue*?

I answer: Never were Protestants more mistaken than in this Matter; since it is most plain to every one that does but look into this Chapter of *St. Paul*, that in this very Chapter where Protestants think all praying in unknown Tongues is forbid, the Apostle licences the *Corinthians* to speak and pray too in any Language, provided there were some one among them that had the Gift of interpreting what was spoke to the People that were present. *Wherefore, v. 13.* says he, *let him that speaketh in an unknown Tongue, pray that he may interpret. If any Man speak in an un-* *v. 27.* *known Tongue, let it be by two, or, at the most, by three, and that by course; and let one interpret.* Does not the Apostle here expressly allow them to speak and pray in unknown Tongues, provided there be an Interpreter? Now, the *Latin* Liturgy of the Church of *Rome* is sufficiently interpreted, and thoroughly explained to all Catholicks, so that those who understand not *Latin*,
are

are well versed in every part of the publick Service, and not only *he that supplies the place of the Ideot, but the Ideot himself*, in the Catholick Church is sufficiently instructed to say *Amen* to the Prayers and Thanksgivings of the Priest: Then the unanswerable Argument of Protestants from this Chapter of *St. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, against our *Latin* Liturgy, is no Argument at all; nay rather are we licensed by the Apostle in this very place to have our Liturgy in *Latin* or any other learned Language; provided it be sufficiently *interpreted* for the Edification of the People, as no one can deny that ours is in many excellent Writings published for that purpose; so that for the Substance of things which are done and said, the Vulgar among Catholicks understand much more of their *Latin* Liturgy, than the Vulgar of Protestants do of their *English* one.

But why so loudly do Protestants exclaim against a *Latin* Liturgy? I appeal to themselves if the following Sentences when read to them in *English* are not the same as if they heard them in *Hebrew*, or *Arabic*? *Moab is my wash-pot, over Edom will I cast out my shoe.* also this: *Though you have lien among*
the

Psalms lx.
v. 8.

the Pots, yet shall ye be as the Wings of Psalms lxviii. v. 13.
a Dove covered with Silver, and her
Feathers with yellow Gold. And this in
the same Psalm: *Rebuke the company of* v. 30.
Spear-men: Or as it is in the Margent:
The Beasts of the Reeds, and the Mul-
titude of the Bulls with the Calves of the
People. Also this as it is in their Ser-
vice Book. *Or ever your pots be made* Psalms lviii. v. 8.
hot with Thorns, so let Indignation vex
him even as a thing that is raw. When
these and such other things are read in
English to the Vulgar, are their Un-
derstandings much edified?

In a word, it is no where determined
by any Command of God, in what
Language the publick Service of the
Church shall be performed; and where
God has interposed no Command (on
either side the Church is left at Discre-
tion to weigh the Reasons on both sides:
This the Catholick Church has done,
and upon mature Deliberation has passed
Judgment, that the Inconveniencies at-
tending a Translation of the Liturgy
into the Vulgar Tongues of all Nations
are insuperable; that such Translations
must unavoidably be full of Mistakes,
which must bring great Confusion into
the Church: That the Conveniency, if
any, in such Translations would be only

to the most ignorant part of the People, and is now very well recompensed by other means, by Prayer Books and Instructions in abundance in the Vulgar Tongue. Therefore most prudently did this Church decree to keep the Liturgy for all these Western parts of the World in one Language, which tho' not known to every Person, is however the most universally known in all Nations of any one Language whatsoever; there being scarce a Market Town throughout *Europe* where it is not publickly taught. Indeed the *Reformed Church*, not being *Catholick* or *Universal*, every Conventicle of that Reformed Church, being confined to narrow Limits, seldom extending beyond the bounds of one Country, Province or Canton, are under no Necessity of having their publick Service-Books in a Language that is known in all Countries. But the *Catholick Church* comprizing in her Communion *all Nations* and *Tongues*, this alone was a very good Reason why this *Universal Church* has made Choice of such Languages for the Liturgy, which in *all Nations* are the most universally spoke and understood.

Now let Protestants maturely consider whether this mighty Stumbling-Block

Block of a *Latin* Liturgy, this great Stone of Offence and Rock of Scandal can justify what they have done in making the most fatal Schism from the Universal Church that ever happened: A Schism which has been the Cause of so many Mischiefs to the whole World, to Kingdoms, to Common-Wealths, to private Families; by dethroning Kings, by disinheriting Children, by Seditions, Treasons, Civil Wars, Massacres, by Penal Laws, and Sanguinary Persecutions; in a word, by all imaginable Calamities, both in Church and State, in Body, and Soul, in Life, and Goods, spreading Desolation every where; and all this because the Catholick Church, to preserve Uniformity in the publick Worship of God, and to avoid the Inconveniencies of a Multiplicity of Translations of the Liturgy, determined to keep it in the *Latin* Tongue in these Western Parts of the World, in which, from the Apostles times, it never was in any other Language: I say, in no other Language but in the *Latin* for *Europe* and *Africa*, tho' *Latin* was not the Vulgar Tongue of all the different Nations of those Parts of the World, even when the *Roman* Eagles where every where spread in them: Nor was

Aas c. ii. v. 6, 8, 9. it in any other Language but *Greek* for most Parts of *Asia*, tho' it is well known from the *Acts*, that *Greek* was not the Vulgar Tongue of all Nations in the East, and that the *Parthians*, *Medes*, *Mesopotamians*, *Phrygians*, *Egyptians*, as also many others, had each a Vulgar Tongue of their own. So that this Demand for a Liturgy in the Vulgar Tongue is in reality a meer singularity and a particular humour of Protestants.

P O I N T XXXIII.

MANY Protestants hold: That to be joined in Communion with the true Church is not necessary to Salvation; and that all, whatsoever Sect they follow, provided they believe in Christ, and lead a moral good Life, will be saved.

Contrary to the written Word of God.
Aas c. ii. v. 47. 1. *And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.*

These remarkable Words might, I think, open the Eyes of Protestants and convince them that to be saved it is necessary to be joined in Communion with the *Apostolical Church*. *Cornelius*
 the

the Centurion led a moral good Life: He was a devout Man and one that *Acts c. x. v. 2.* feared God with his whole House, and gave much Alms to the People, and prayed to God always, as the Word of God witnesses: Yet after the Establishment of the Church of Christ on Earth, all this was not sufficient for his Salvation, on which account an Angel is sent to bring St. Peter to him, that he might be not only instructed in the Faith of Christ, but also brought into the Communion of the Apostolical Church. For the holy Scripture in one place teaching that *without Faith it is impossible to please God*; and in another place, that this Faith is *but one*, these two places put together prove, that unless we hold one true Faith, saved we cannot be. And this one true Faith being only taught in the one true Church of Christ, therefore all are commanded to *bear the Church* (which is only done by those who are joined to its Communion) under Pain of having their Portion with Heathens and Publicans. *Heb. c. xi. v. 6. Ephef. c. iv. v. 5. Matth. c. xviii. v. 17.*

2. Now the works of the Flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, Fornication, Uncleanness, Idolatry, Witchcraft, Hatred, Variance, Emulations, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Heresies, &c. *Gal. c. v. v. 19, 20, &c.*

Of the which I foretold you, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.

Here let Protestants remark that *Heresy* is by the Apostle numbred among those Sins which exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven, and is put in the same Catalogue of Crimes with *Idolatry* and *Witchcraft*. The same thing is proved from other parts of Scripture, where Hereticks and especially Heresiarks are stigmatized by our Saviour Christ and his Apostles with the name of *false Prophets*, *grievous Wolves*, *false Apostles*, *deceitful Workers*. Which argues that the Sin of those that teach Heresy is very grievous; and as their Followers more or less partake of their Sin, have they not Reason to fear they will be involved in their Punishment?

Matth. c.

vii. v. 15.

Acts c.

xx. v. 29.

2 Cor. c.

xi v. 13.

Ep. Tit.

3. 11. v.

12.

Numb. c.

xvi. v. 31.

v. 49.

3. *Immediately therefore when he had done speaking the Earth clave asunder that was under them, and opened her Mouth, and swallowed them up with their Tents and all their Substance, and they went down alive into Hell covered under the Ground, and perished from amidst the Multitude. And those that were stricken were to the number of fourteen thousand and seven hundred, besides*

besides them that had perished in the Sedition of Core.

Here we read of the three famous Schismaticks, *Core, Dathan, and Abi- ren* who, out of jealousy to the Authority which God had given to *Moyse*s and *Aaron* over the Children of *Israel*, drew into their Party, two hundred and fifty more *Peers of the Synagogue*, and *v. 2.* with them made a Schism, endeavouring to withdraw the People from their Obedience to the Priesthood of *Aaron*, pretending, that any Man had as good a Right to offer Incense as *Aaron*, and therefore they would no longer obey but shake off the Yoke. I need not here say how these Men were punished, this the Scripture relates at full length: And what was properly the Sin for which they were so dreadfully punished? The Sin of Schism, for refusing to obey the Authority which God had given to *Moyse*s over the Children of *Israel*, and for resisting the Priesthood which God had fixed to the Family of *Aaron*, which they usurped to themselves; and tho' they offered Incense to the same God that *Moyse*s and *Aaron* did, to the true God, yet because they did it in Opposition to *Aaron*, it was therefore deemed a Rebellion *against* See *v. 11.*
 God

God himself who gave the Priesthood to *Aaron*, which is the very Crime in which all Schismatics, who now rebel against the Church of Christ, are engaged, and the same Act of Schism which is done by them. And why did God punish these first Schismatics in this extraordinary Manner, but to shew that he does not receive Sacrifice from any but such Priests as are ordained by his Order; that no Service or Worship is pleasing to him which is done in Heretical and Schismatical Congregations? Nay, we read that fourteen thousand and seven hundred of the People too were struck dead with the Plague, only for murmuring at *Moyse* and *Aaron*, and taking part with the Schismatics, (nor could the Wrath of God be appeased but by the Mediation of the true Priesthood of *Aaron*;) which was done to be a warning to all others how they communicate with Hereticks and Schismatics in the Acts of their Heresy and Schism, much less allow them to be in the way of Salvation.

v. 48.

Latitudinarian Protestants reply: That the things in which one Sect of Christians differ from another, are oftentimes Matters of small Moment, that they all believe in Christ and hold the Foundation;

Foundation; so that altho' some of them are fallen into Errours, yet so long as they hold all *Fundamental* Articles, they hope their Errours are not strictly Heretical, damnable and destructive of Salvation.

To whom I answer: As to the famous Distinction between Errours *Fundamental* and *not Fundamental*, I shall meddle no farther with it here, but to shew, that in the present Debate it can be of no Service to Protestants. For admit that some revealed Truths are of greater Moment than others, and consequently, that there are Errours of greater and lesser Moment; yet who will dare to say, that any one revealed Truth is not of *great Moment*? Who will maintain, that Christ revealed any *unnecessary* Article of Faith? And what sort of Christians are they who think, that any Errour can be innocent which is with Obstinacy defended against any one of those Articles which he thought necessary to reveal? Strangely mistaken are the Divines of the Protestant Church, if they imagin that our Faith is to be measured by the Smallness or Greatness of the things that are to be believed: For since it is equally impossible for God to reveal Falshood in

The PROTESTANT'S Tryal.

Matters of lesser as in things of greater Importance, consequently, we are equally bound to believe him in lesser as well as greater, in Articles which Protestants are pleased to term *not Fundamental*, as well as in those they call *Fundamental*; and it is equally injurious to God to call his Veracity in Question in one as well as the other. This I take to be Self-evident: And since all *Seets* are engaged in Errours contrary to some revealed Truth, (otherwise they would not be *Seets*) and maintain their Errours with Obstinacy, which is the very Essence of Heresy; it follows, that they are all guilty of that Sin, which the Apostle declares will exclude them from the Kingdom of Heaven.

As to the main Pretence of these *Latitudinarian* Protestants, *that a Belief in Christ joined with a moral good Life is sufficient to carry any one to Heaven*, it will be found upon Examination to have no solid Truth in it. For if by their *Belief in Christ*, they mean such a Belief of him as carries with it an Obligation of believing too *all that he taught, and of observing all things whatsoever he commanded under pain of Damnation.* Such a Belief in Christ

Mark c.
xvi. v. 16.

Christ takes in all the Points of Faith by him revealed, one of which is, that there is one true Church which we are bound to hear and obey; it takes in all the Sacraments by him instituted, the *Agenda* as well as *Credenda*; and if such a Belief in Christ be allowed necessary to Salvation, it follows, that Salvation is not to be had in any Sect, because there is no Sect that believes *all that Christ taught and commanded*. But if by their *Belief in Christ*, they only mean the Belief of his Person, *viz.* that he was the Son of God made Man, who died for our Redemption, rose again to Life and ascended into Heaven, what will any one be the better for thus believing in Christ, if they do not also believe what he taught, and do what he has commanded? Such a meer speculative Belief of the Incarnation of Christ, instead of being sufficient for Salvation, will certainly contribute to their greater Condemnation. For will not they who believe him to be their God and Redeemer, and yet do not believe what he taught, will not they have more to answer for, than those who never heard of Christ? Then as to the Pretence of *a moral good Life*, I absolutely deny, that *out of the true*

Faith any such Persons are to be found who lead such a moral good Life as to be in the Sight of God justified. I grant indeed, that *the Heathen Morality* may be found out of the true Church in some few Persons among Hereticks and Schismaticks, nay, even among those who deny all revealed Religion, some few there are who are honest, and innocent between Man and Man; who upon Occasions will be true to their Trust, and faithful to their Friend; who are prudent in their worldly Concerns, and temperate in their way of living, bridling themselves from the common Vices and Immoralities of the times; at the same time they live like Heathens with respect to God, without Religion and Devotion; without a Faith of those things which God has revealed and promised, without the Fear and Love of God, which is the first and greatest of all the Commandments of the *Moral Law*; and how then can they be said to lead a *truly moral good Life*, who live in the continual Neglect of that great Commandment? Are they Christians who affirm that this sort of *Heathen Virtue* which is sometimes found among those who have no Religion, and in Sects that are unbaptized,

unbaptized, is sufficient to justify them in the Sight of God? I grant too, that out of the true Church among Sectaries many there are who are very constant in going to that Worship which their Conventicle prescribes, and these are what some call, *good in their way*, but since *the way itself is bad*, and in their Worship they communicate with Hereticks and Schismatics in the very Acts of Heresy and Schism, what Opinion can those, who know this, have of such kind of Devotion? I grant too, that there are many among Protestants who give liberal Alms-deeds to the Poor, and provided they do not do this in Opposition to the true Church with design to uphold the Credit of their Heresy (in which Case their Action in itself good, does by their bad Motive become sinful;) I say, that for this and all other Good-works they are to be highly commended, but then as they imitate *Cornelius* the Centurion in giving *much Alms to the People* while *Acts. 10.* they are out of the Church themselves, let them learn by his Example, that their Good-works done out of the true Church will not carry them to Heaven unless, like him, they join themselves to the Communion of it.

The

The Truth is, that the World has a mistaken Notion of a moral good Life, and often take their Idea of it from the Virtues of the Heathens; whereas that, which is reputed *moral living* by the World, falls far below that Purity of Life and Morals which the holy Scriptures require to the Character of a Man truly just and virtuous. There we find, that the just Man is he who not only complies with all Duties between Man and Man, but with all Duties both to God and Man; he who not only refrains from some more notorious Vices, but from all Vices; he who not only keeps some but all the Commandments; in a word, there we read, that *the just Man lives by Faith*; there we find it proved at length, that from the Beginning of the World no one was ever justified without a *Faith* of what God has revealed and promised; that *without Faith, it is impossible to please God*, nor does Faith alone justify without Good-works, as Good-works cannot justify without Faith; which Truths are both clearly written in the Word of God. From whence we conclude, that *out of the true Faith* no such Persons can be found who lead moral good Lives so as to be in the Sight of God justified.

But

St James
c. ii. v. 10.

1 Jo. c.

iii. v. 6,

9.

1 John c.

ii. v. 4.

Luke c. i.

v. 6.

Heb. c. x.

v. 38.

Heb. c. xi.

Heb. c. xi.

v. 6.

James c.

ii. v. 6,

&c.

•But may not invincible Ignorance excuse many from the Guilt of Heresy and Schism, who are engaged in it thro' meer Mistake and a wrong Education, and are in no Capacity of undeceiving themselves?

I answer, that if any such there are among Sectaries who are absolutely Ideots, who scarce have Sense or Education enough to know that there are any other Pastors or Church but their own, and pretend not to pass their Judgment at all upon other Religions, for want of Capacity to do it, and indeed are in no Capacity of knowing any thing about Religion, but what their own Pastor pleases to teach them, having no Learning to examine into such Matters; such by their invincible Ignorance may escape the Guilt of Heresy or Schism; because their Infidelity is purely *negative*, and God will not impute it to those who have it not in their Power to avoid it. Now whether such invincible Ignorance is to be found in these Parts of the World, where the true Church is ever visible, I leave others to determine, certain it is, that Gentlemen and Gentlewomen who have had a liberal Education, as also Tradesmen and others, who are in a Capacity of being better informed, and
who

who know well enough, where that spiritual Authority is to which they owe their Subjection ; are not comprehended in this Case with Ideots, and it is much to be feared that the true Reason they are not actually in the Communion of the true Church, is because they are not in it even in *voto*, in Heart and Desire, which all must allow to be the indispensable Obligation of all that hope for Salvation. But in reality, the Dispute betwixt us and *Latitudinarian* Protestants, is not whether some few Persons in some rare accidental Circumstances of invincible Ignorance, Incapacity, or want of means to be instructed may be excusable ; but whether Heresy and Schism considered in their own Nature are Sins which destroy Salvation ? We affirm they do, and so does the Word of God too.

Latitudinarian Protestants reply once more : That certainly all are excusable, who think in their Conscience they are in the right Way.

But this is directly contrary to the written Word of God, where we are taught, that *there is a way which seemeth right unto a Man, but the end thereof are the ways of Death*. Then, every one who thinks in his Conscience that
he

Prov. c.

xiv. v. 12.

he is in the right way to Heaven is not so indeed. *The time cometh* (said our Saviour to his Disciples) *that whosoever killeth you, will think that he doth God* Jo. c. xvi. v. 2. *service.* Those who persecuted the Apostles and put them and the primitive Christians to Death, for teaching the Faith of Christ, thought in their Conscience that they did God good Service by it: Yet I suppose no Protestant will say they were excusable from Sin. Then, all are not excusable who think in their Conscience they do right. Before it can be proved, that what People call *their Conscience* excuses them from Sin when they act contrary to their Duty and Obligations; it must first be proved, that Pride, Obstinacy, Self-Interest, and Passion have no Influence in forming Mens Opinions and Perswasions, which they in other Words call *their Conscience*; for it is evident, that such a *Conscience* springs from Vice, and is therefore sinful, and consequently, instead of excusing those who act according to it, is itself punishable and liable to Correction.

But after all, is it not a great want of Charity in Catholicks to say that no one can be saved out of the true Faith?

To

By the
Author of
the Catho-
lick An-
swer to
Mr. Bar-
ret's Ser-
mon.

To which I answer in the Words of
a learned Divine : “ That it is no want
“ of Charity at all. For in the first
“ Place what we say of this matter,
“ we say not from ourselves but from
“ the Word of God. True Charity
“ consisting in loving God above all
“ things, and our Neighbour, whether
“ Friend or Enemy, as ourselves. But
“ to true Charity it never did nor ever
“ will belong, to find either for our-
“ selves or others more than one way
“ to Heaven. And the Reason is, be-
“ cause indeed, Men have not Autho-
“ rity to allow People Salvation just as
“ they please, but only according to
“ the Terms which God most justly
“ requires of us all to be saved. For
“ God, tho’ he be *Charity itself*, yet
“ he does not promise us his King-
“ dom otherwise than upon certain
“ Conditions. Now one of these Con-
“ ditions is, that we hold the true Faith
“ which Christ and the Apostles taught,
“ and hear and obey the true Church.
“ *He that believeth not shall be Damned.*
“ *If he neglect to hear the Church, let*
“ *him be unto thee as a Heathen-man*
“ *and a Publican.* In like manner we
“ declare openly, that People cannot
“ be saved without Baptism, nor with-
“ out

1 Jo. c.
iv. v. 16.

Mark c.
xvi. v. 16.
Matth. c.
xviii. v.
17:

“ out keeping the Commandments, and
 “ if Infidels and wicked Men take this
 “ ill of us we cannot help it. Nay to
 “ teach them this Truth is the *Effect*
 “ of *Charity* not the *want* of it. Sup-
 “ posing I and another Person were
 “ crossing the Sea in different Ships,
 “ and I knew that the other Person’s
 “ Vessel, being faulty and rotten,
 “ would certainly be cast away; would
 “ it not be true Kindness in me to
 “ admonish and convince him that he
 “ was in the utmost Danger of being
 “ lost, and advise him to change his
 “ Ship? Tho’ perhaps he might take
 “ it ill of me at first, that I should
 “ pretend my Ship to be better than
 “ his. *True Charity* flatters not, nor
 “ does it invent new Ways to Heaven,
 “ but does all it can to help all thither
 “ according to the *old Way* the *only*
 “ *Way*. On which Account it admo-
 “ nishes, proves, and endeavours to con-
 “ vince all People of the Mistakes and
 “ Errours in which they are engaged.
 “ And it is plain to the World, that
 “ this is what the Priests and Preachers
 “ of the Catholick Church have con-
 “ tinually done, even to the loss of their
 “ Blood and their Lives. How then
 “ can any one accuse us of the *want*
 “ of

“ *of Charity*, when our Saviour in the
 Jo. c. xv. “ Gospel has declared, that *no one can*
 v. 13. “ *have a greater Charity, than to lay*
 “ *down his Life for the sake of his*
 “ *Friends.*”

We do therefore most humbly beg
 and conjure all Protestants to believe,
 that it is not the want of Good-will to
 them, but the abundance of evidence,
 which forces us to declare this neces-
 sary Truth, that unless they hold the true
 Faith which Christ and the Apostles
 taught, and hear and obey the true
 Church, vain is their hope of Salvation.

CONCLUSION.

I Shall conclude with setting down to
 Protestants some Marks or Notes,
 taken from *the written Word*, by which
 they may yet farther convince them-
 selves that they are not in the true
 Church of Christ.

ONE.

Ephes. c.
 iv. v. 5.

First, In the *One Church* of Christ
 from the Beginning, there was but *One*
Faith, as the Apostle Witnesses. *One*
Lord, One Faith, One Baptism. But
 the Reformed Church of Protestants does
 not hold *one* and the same Faith, af-
 firming that to be true Faith in *one*
 Country

Country which it denies in another; *Lutherans* holding the *Real Presence* in *Germany*, which *Sacramentarians*, who are as good Protestants as they, deny in *Switzerland*; *Calvinists* rejecting *Episcopacy*, which the true Church of *England* maintains; the Church of *England* disputing the Validity of Lay-baptism, at the same time, nine Parts in ten of all the Protestants in the World must defend Lay-baptism, to be valid or themselves to be unbaptized. Then it is plain to a demonstration, that the *Reformed Church*, whose Members are all divided in Faith, and who seem to agree in no one Point so much as in *the very Principle of Division*, which is that of referring Controversies to the private Judgment of the contending Parties; it is, I say, from hence evident, that the Reformed Church of Protestants cannot be the Church of Christ, in which we are fully assured by the *written Word of God* there was *but One Faith*. And indeed, considering that the Faith was planted by the Apostles, who were inspired by the Holy Ghost, it was not possible there could be any more than *One*.

Secondly, The Church of Christ is a *HOLY*. Holy Church, so *the written Word of Ephes. c.* God teaches: That Christ gave himself *v. v. 25,*
for *26, 27.*

for it : That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of Water, by the Word ; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having Spot or Wrinkle, or any such thing ; but that it should be Holy and without Blemish.

For indeed what was the Church instituted for but to teach us to be Holy, and to give to God his due Honour?

Now, *Sanctity* may either appear in the Doctrine of the Church, or in the Lives of the Faithful, and both these Ways it is a distinctive Mark, by which we can prove the Catholick Church, not the Reformed Church of Protestants to be the true Church of Christ. As to Sanctity of Manners, to know whether this Mark agrees to the Catholick or to the Protestant Church, we cannot take a better Method, than to consider what are generally the Means to attain to Sanctity, and then see which Church uses the Means, from whence we may conclude where the Fruit and Effect of it will be. And do we not all know, that Holiness consists in subduing our Passions, in mortifying the Flesh, in denying our own Will, and taking up of our Cross? and what more proper for chastizing the Body, than discreet Fasting? what more proper to bridle

us from Sin than Confession to a Priest, and obliging the Sinner to a proper Satisfaction by the Punishment of his own Person? Now it must be owned there is more of this in the Catholick, than in the Protestant Church, since Protestants boast of having rooted out all these Practices from among their People; Fasting, Confession, Satisfaction for Sin, and whatever is mortifying to human Nature; and not only have omitted and cast out every thing that was troublefom to the old Man, but even blame and condemn those who put such things in Practice. Then as to Sanctity of Doctrine, whether the Doctrine of the Catholick Church or the Protestant be the most excellent, let the World judge by the Effects and Consequence. *The Law of God is Holy Psalm and unspotted converting Souls. The Word* xviii. v. 8. *of God is full of Life and Efficacy, sharper* Heb. c. iv. *than a two edged Sword. The true Faith* v. 12. and Doctrine is usually accompanied with the Grace of God, which converts Souls; that Doctrine therefore which is the most powerful and efficacious in converting Souls, which has penetrated into the remotest Country, and into the Hearts of Infidels, that we may conclude to be holy Doctrine, to be the

the pure Word of God; but the Histories and Annals of the World all bear Evidence that the *Roman* Faith and Doctrine, not that of Protestants, converted all Kingdoms and Nations, *England* in particular, from their Infidelity and Idolatry. All impartial judges then must confess, that *Holiness of Doctrine* belongs to the Catholick not to the Protestant Church. Nay, there is even Demonstration, that the Doctrine of the Reformed Church is not holy or sound Doctrine. For since the Reformed Church teaches a different Faith in different Countries, affirming that to be true in one Nation which it denies in another; believing some things to be necessary to Salvation in one part of the World, which it teaches to be by no means necessary in another, declaring Episcopacy to be essential to the very Being of a Church in *England*, and in *Scotland* not to be of *Divine Institution* but *Antichristian*; I say, the Faith and Doctrine of the Reformed Church which is made up of so many Contradictions, cannot be *Holy* nor from the Holy Ghost; and therefore the Church that teaches such Doctrine cannot be the true Church of Christ.

3. The Church of Christ, according CATHOLICK. to holy Scripture, was to be spread in all Nations; and to be extended to all Ages after Christ to the End of the World. *First*, that it was to be spread in all Nations is proved from these Words: *In thy Seed shall be bless'd all the Nations of the Earth.*—*Ask of me and I will give thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the Earth for thy Possession.*—*Ye shall be Witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the Earth.*—*And this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the World for a Witness unto all Nations.* *Secondly*, That the Church of Christ was to be extended to all Ages after Christ to the End of the World is also plain from the written Word. *Behold I am with you all Days even unto the End of the World.*—*Upon this Rock I will build my Church and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* We are then fully assured from the written Word, that the Church of Christ beginning from Jerusalem was spread in all Nations, and has continued without Interruption throughout all Ages, constantly teaching the true Faith and Doctrine of Christ:

Gen. c.

xxii. v.

18.

Psalms c.

ii. v. 8.

Acts c. i.

v. 8.

Matth. c.

xxiv. v.

14.

Matth. c.

xxviii. v.

20.

Matth. c.

xvi. v. 18.

Christ. But we are as fully assured both from the Evidence of Fact, and from the Confession of Protestants, that for many long Ages before the Reformation, *There was no Church in any one Nation, Province or City of the whole Earth*, which taught the Doctrine of Protestants, when all Nations were overrun with Popery; then it is a strict Demonstration that the Doctrine of Protestants is not the Doctrine of Christ, nor their Faith the Faith of Christ, nor their Church the Church of Christ.

APOSTO-
LICAL.

Fourthly, That Church is the Apostolical Church, whose Pastors have in all Ages upwards to the Apostle been ordained, called and authorised to preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments, by those who were lawfully ordained in like manner and sent before them, by which means the present Pastors of the Church may shew, that they succeed the Apostles. As for instance, that the present Bishop of *Rome* does succeed in the Place of *St. Peter*, and inherits his Power. Now, it is impossible for Protestants to produce a Line of Protestant Bishops and Pastors up to the Apostles, because themselves confess, that there were *neither Protestant Pastors or People*

People for a thousand Years and upwards before the Reformation, when whole Christendom was over-run with Popery. Then, they cannot prove that they are the Successors of the Apostles, nor consequently their Church to be the *Apostolical Church*.

Again, *The Apostolical Church* is that to which our Saviour gave a Power of working Miracles and casting out Devils.

And these Signs shall follow them that Believe; in my name shall they cast out Demons, they shall speak with new Tongues,

Mark. c.

xvi. v.

17.

they shall lay Hands on the Sick, and they shall recover.---Then he called his twelve Disciples together, and gave them Power and Authority over all Devils, and

Luke c.

ix. v. 1.

to cure Diseases. It is indeed politick enough in Protestants, to give out that Miracles ceased soon after the Apostles, being conscious to themselves that not the least shadow of a Miracle has ever been wrought in the reformed Church. However Catholics, to the Confusion of the Protestant Religion, can prove by undeniable Evidence, that great Miracles have been done in the Catholick Church in every Age since the Apostles. We do not indeed pretend, that the Power of working Miracles is *ordinarily* annexed to the Ministry of Preaching

L

now,

*L. 22. de
Civ. D.
c. 8.*

*Hif. l. 1.
c. 26.*

*Navig.
Vol. ii.
Part ii. p.
88.*

See the
thirteenth
Chapter
for every
Century.

now, as it was in the Beginning of the Church. But we affirm, that there have been, in every Age since, some extraordinary Persons in the Catholick Church who have been endowed with the Gift of Miracles, as well for the Comfort of the Faithful, as for the Conversion of Infidels; of which Kind of Miracles the Writings of the Fathers and all Church-Histories are full. Witness, *St. Augustin* for the many Cures wrought at *St. Stephen's* Reliques. Witness, *Venerable Bede*, for many great Miracles wrought by *St. Augustin* the Monk, in the Conversion of *England*. Witness, Church-History for the Miracles wrought by *St. Bernard*. Witness, *Hackluit* a Protestant, for those done by *St. Francis Xavierius* in the Conversion of the *Indians*. Witness, the Protestant Centuriators of *Magdeburg* for many signal Miracles done by *Roman* Catholicks in every Age for thirteen hundred Years after Christ, so well attested, that they are published to the World by Protestants themselves. As to the Truth then of these Miracles we have all the Evidence that can be had for any Miracles; for Miracles being the last and highest Proof of other things, can have no Proof for themselves but the Evidence of

of Sense to those that see them done, and their Testimony and Report to others. Now Miracles being the last and highest Proof that can be had for the Truth of any Doctrine, we conclude the *Roman Church*, whose Faith has ever been by Miracles attested, not the *Reformed Church*, in which Miracles are ceased, is the true Church of Christ.

But what ever Exception Protestants may make against the Truth of our Miracles so well attested, if still they obstinately insist, that all Miracles are ceased because no longer necessary, they must however confess, *that the Power over Demons is as necessary for this Age, as ever it was in any*, and is an ordinary Power to continue for ever in the *Apostolical Church*: But the *Reformed Church* does not so much as pretend to this *Power over Demons*, and Experience sufficiently shews it is not there: Then the *Reformed Church* is not the *Apostolical Church*.

To conclude, the *Apostolical Church* is that to whose Pastors our Saviour Christ gave a Commission to preach the Faith to all Nations: *Go ye therefore Matth. c. and teach all Nations. To preach the Gospel to every Creature: Preach ye the* ^{xxviii. v.} ^{19.}

Mark c. xvi. v. 15. Gospel to every Creature. To be his Witnesses unto the utmost Bounds of the Earth; *Ye shall be Witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, even unto the uttermost Part of the Earth.* That Doctrine therefore which has converted the Idolaters to believe in Christ, we may rest satisfied, is the true *Apostolical Doctrine*; and that Church which has effectually succeeded in this great Work of the Conversion of the *Heathens* to the Faith of Christ, is the *Apostolical Church*: Now, this the Church of *Rome* has done, preached the Gospel to all Nations, converted all the Idolaters that have been hitherto converted; whereas the Reformed Church of Protestants, has not yet converted any one Nation from Idolatry: Then the Reformed Church of Protestants is not the *Apostolical Church*. That they may return to the Communion of that Church on Earth, and be for ever in the Church Triumphant, shall be my daily Prayer.

F I N I S.

8 AU 68

